

THE Monthly Repository.

No. CCXXV.]

SEPTEMBER, 1824.

[Vol. XIX.

Mr. Bakewell on the State of Morals and Religion at Geneva, in Reply to the Letters of Dr. J. Pye Smith.

9, Torrington Square,
Bloomsbury.

I HAVE read with some surprise the two letters of Dr. J. Pye Smith, in the Monthly Repository for June and July, (pp. 321, 404,) purporting to be a reply to the letters of M. Chenevière. The representations given by Dr. S. of the past and present state of Geneva, appear to me to be in many respects erroneous and even in direct opposition to facts; and in no part are they more so, than where he confidently asserts that the moral and religious character of the Genevese has degenerated in proportion to their departure from the orthodox theology of their forefathers: this assumed degeneracy Dr. S. evidently insinuates, is a necessary consequence of an approximation to Unitarianism. It is but justice to our Genevese brethren to point out the errors in Dr. Smith's statements; and the evidence of an English layman may, perhaps, be more favourably received, than that of the Genevese pastors themselves, in a case where they are the party accused.

I resided two whole winters in Geneva, in the years 1820—1822, and endeavoured as far as I was able, to obtain a correct view of the state of society and of the religious parties there, and more particularly to ascertain the real state of morals in this little Republic, since it regained its independence in 1815. The results of my observations and inquiries are already before the public.* I have impartially stated what I conceive to be defects in their public worship and the faults of the religious parties in their conduct to each other. In all long controversies, whether of a religious or temporal nature, it rarely, perhaps never, happens, that both

sides are entirely free from blame: a want of charity may, perhaps, be found both among the members of the church within the walls of Geneva, and among the members of the little church without the gates.

‘Iliacos intra muros peccatur et extra.’

I have, however, no hesitation in expressing an opinion founded on my own observations, that M. Malan, the head of the little church without the gates, has evinced more of a persecuting spirit than his opponents. Dr. S. may reply, “Is this possible? The opponents of M. Malan have all the power of the Church and State in their own hands.” Granted: but I hold that man to be a persecutor in the worst sense of the word who depreciates the character of his neighbour, because he does not adopt the same creed as his own, who, on this account, represents him in his public discourses as irreligious and an enemy to Christ, and who endeavours to destroy his respectability and influence in society. I say such a man is a persecutor, whether he have or have not the temporal power to punish those whom he defames.

On re-perusing the letters of Dr. J. P. Smith, I confess my surprise at their contents was considerably diminished, for I observe, he states that he does not write from the information received from his Genevese friends, ‘but from his own resources only;’ he adds, ‘the paper of M. Chenevière, with such a general acquaintance with the facts as I conceive myself possessed of, is sufficient for the occasion.’ Certainly sufficient for the occasion, when that occasion was to deal out vituperation with an unsparing hand to “M. Chenevière and his *ruthless associates*, the pastors of the Genevese Church.”* Im-

* Travels in the Tarentaise and various parts of the Grecian and Pennine Alps, and in Switzerland and Auvergne. 2 vols.

* I confess I was startled by the epithet *ruthless*, applied by Dr. S. to a body of ministers eminent for every

partial research into facts and circumstances was not necessary for the purpose; an active imagination was more serviceable, and Dr. S. appears to me to have been greatly indebted to it, for the supply of his materials, as his representations bear little resemblance to the past or present state of Geneva. I am glad, however, that Dr. S. has directed the attention of your readers to the history of the Church of Geneva during the golden age of its orthodoxy: few persons in England, nor does Dr. S. himself, possess any correct knowledge of the spirit of that Church, at least he did not before he wrote the postscript to his two letters, otherwise it would never have entered his mind to cite the case of Servetus, as the last instance of cruel intolerance in that city. For nearly a century after the murder of Servetus, the most bitter spirit of persecution inspired the orthodox clergy of Geneva; many persons were sentenced to death for dissenting from the creed of Calvin; and banishment, fine and imprisonment, were lavishly dealt out to minor heretics. Indeed, it would be difficult to name a place, where excessive intolerance and cruel persecution were so incessantly active as at Geneva, in the blessed times that preceded the death of the venerable Benedict Pictet. Cruelty seems to have been here a prominent feature of the Calvinistic church; and lest the victims to orthodoxy should not be sufficiently numerous, sorcery was made a capital crime, punishable by death, and in the short space of sixty years, so many persons were burned for this supposed offence, that if we compare the whole population of Geneva with that of England only, and suppose a proportional number of sorcerers to have been executed here in the reign of George the Third, it would amount to one hundred and twenty-five thousand! * The case of Ni-

Christian virtue; but candour obliges me to notice the polite forbearance of the Doctor, in not associating the adjective ruthless with its almost inseparable adjuncts (monster or villain): these he left to be supplied by the reader.

* The population of Geneva amounted to about 12,000, and the executions for sorcery in sixt years were one hundred and fifty.

colas Antoine is very imperfectly stated by Dr. Smith: he tells us he was a poor man evidently deranged, who was strangled and burned for apostatizing to Judaism. There is much reason to believe that Nicolas Antoine was a sincere but timid Unitarian, who became delirious from the extreme agitation of mind excited by the struggle between a sense of duty and a dread of punishment. I shall quote what I have stated respecting him in the second volume of my Travels: it is extracted principally from Picot's *Histoire de Genève*. The writers of the time when the execution took place were too much prejudiced to give a fair statement, but sufficient is shewn to prove the diabolical spirit of the orthodox clergy, by whom the persecution was instigated. " Nicolas Antoine embraced the Protestant religion at the age of twenty: he is described as possessing very amiable manners and correct morals: he was appointed pastor in a Genevese church near Gex, a few miles north of Geneva. He was much addicted to the study of the Hebrew Scripture, and was said to be inclined to Judaism, taking all his texts from the Old Testament and repeating the Apostles' Creed with a faint voice. His congregation was much attached to him, and did not notice his peculiarities, till preaching one day on the second Psalm, he declared that the prophecy did not relate to Christ but to David. The next day he was seized with a brain fever, and exclaimed against the Trinity. During his frenzy, he escaped from his keepers, and was taken to the hospital at Geneva to be cured, but the pastors of Geneva desired that he might be put in prison. In this state of mental derangement he was examined and declared to be a heretic who deserved death; he was strangled and burned under the walls of Geneva in 1632, at the age of thirty."

Granting that a sincere conversion to the religion of Moses were a crime, yet how slight is the evidence of that crime in this case! Indeed the annals of the Church of Rome present few instances of intolerant cruelty, to compare with the execution of Nicolas Antoine. There were at that time some of the Genevese pastors who did not approve of the act, and a few

years afterwards, many of them became convinced that the dogmas for which they and their ancestors had been so cruelly tenacious, were unfounded in scripture and opposite to the mild spirit of the gospel; they therefore made an effort to be relieved from subscription to the creed of Calvin, but they did not succeed till after the year 1700.

Dr. Smith seems very desirous to have it believed, that after this, the morals of the Genevese became very depraved, in consequence of their departure from the rigid principles of Calvin. "Scarcely" (says he) "was the venerable Benedict Pictet cold in his grave, when a general lukewarmness and a manifest departure took place, with regard to the great doctrine of the Reformation, salvation and holiness by grace, through faith in a Divine Redeemer. I appeal to all who inquire into the history of Geneva, whether it is not an undeniable fact, that the relaxation of manners among all ranks of his fellow-citizens has increased and spread, in proportion to the departure from the old theology. Is it not a fact that *open infidels and immoral persons have exceedingly multiplied*, that such characters, perfectly notorious for infidelity and vice, come regularly to the holy communion whenever the routine requires it, without remonstrance and the smallest impediment, and that blasphemy and profligacy have increased at a fearful rate, without any counterbalancing increase of pious, humble, sober, and virtuous Christians?"

From this confident appeal of Dr. Smith, and from the whole tenor of his letters, a person unacquainted with Geneva, might conclude that the inhabitants of this little Republic were notoriously irreligious and immoral, and on the other hand, that Geneva in the days of its orthodoxy was indeed a city set upon a hill, filled with holy men and sincere Christians. Now I boldly challenge Dr. Smith to name any city of equal size where Calvinism is the dominant religion, or indeed any city containing twenty thousand people, either in Protestant or Catholic Europe, equally advanced in civilization, where, among all classes, public or private morals are more correct, where there is less vice of any kind, or where

so large a portion of the population has received a religious education, and is so well instructed in the evidences and leading principles of Christianity. I have been in almost every large town and city in England and Scotland, and in several cities on the Continent, but I know none that can compare with Geneva in these respects.

It should also be borne in mind, that a large number of the lower class in Geneva, both domestic servants, porters and labourers, are either Catholic-savoyards or natives of the more orthodox Cantons, for whose religious principles the Pastors of Geneva cannot be considered as responsible. By the partition of Europe in 1815, Geneva received a considerable increase of Catholic population, whereas in the orthodox days of the Republic, the number of Catholics within its walls were few, and the whole population scarcely exceeded half its present amount: yet if the evidence of contemporary writers may be believed, there is much reason to conclude that, even in the halcyon days of the Republic, when its faith shone so bright, the morals of the inhabitants were not so good as at present. At that period, avarice, selfishness, deceit and sensuality greatly prevailed, though often cloaked under the semblance of piety; there were abundance of long prayers and many outward religious observances; but the evidence of Bishop Burnet cannot be doubted; his faith was in perfect accordance with that of the Church of Geneva; and he says the orthodox Genevese were notorious for cheating and insincerity. He visited Geneva in 1685, and tells us, "The public justice is quick and good, and more commended than the private justice (honesty) of those who deal in trade. *A want of sincerity is much lamented by those who know the town well. There is no public lewdness tolerated, and the disorders of that sort are managed with great address.*" The religious sensualists of those days seem to have adopted the sentiment of Milton's Comus,

"—'Tis only daylight that makes sin.'

Again and again did the avaricious spirit of the Genevese render them the dupes of charlatans, who pre-

tended to possess the art of making gold, and offered to enrich the citizens; some said that they desired the gold to enable them to serve the Lord, by supporting the hospital, but the governor of that establishment told them, they could not serve God with money of the Devil's making. In these orthodox times, when, according to Dr. Smith, the morals were so much purer than at present, it is true the sabbath was most sanctimoniously observed; the shepherds were forbidden to sound their horns on that day to collect their flocks; no public worship of any other church was tolerated; even the Prince of Brandenberg, in 1671, was not permitted to have the Lutheran service performed in his own house. *None could receive the Lord's Supper without a licence from their pastors, and those who did not receive it, were subject to heavy fines or banishment.* Any person who kept his bed for three whole days without sending for a pastor, was subject to fine; the nurses and relations were also fined. The soldier who kept guard fell upon his knees in the street, and repeated prayers before opening and shutting the gates. No wig was allowed to descend more than six inches below the chin, and the head-dresses of the women were not allowed to rise higher than six inches above the forehead.

What would have been the language of Christ had he visited the Pharisees of Geneva at this period, when the fires, lighted by cruelty and intolerance, were scarcely extinct beneath their walls? "Ye hypocrites, ye pay tythes of mint and anise and cummin, and neglect justice and mercy and honesty, and the weightier matters of the law."

I have little doubt, however, that there were in Geneva at that time, as well as at the present, many sincere Christians and virtuous men; but I do not believe that the inhabitants generally, were more virtuous than the modern Genevese, notwithstanding the confident assertions of Dr. Smith to the contrary; and, what is still more to the purpose, notwithstanding the efforts made by the French Government to demoralize the citizens when Geneva was united to France.

I trust I shall be excused for dwelling some time on the charge of immo-

rality brought by Dr. S. against the Genevese, as he plainly infers that this increase of vice is a direct consequence of their departure from the orthodox theology of their forefathers. Similar charges have been often made against Unitarians by a certain class of Christians, but frequently in so vague a manner, as not to admit of an answer. Here, however, we have a bill of accusation against the people and pastors of a whole state, of which the majority are Unitarians, or hold the doctrine of the Trinity to be unscriptural and of human invention. "Is it not a fact," (says Dr. S.,) "that open infidels and immoral persons have exceedingly multiplied in Geneva?" I reply directly, No; but even were it so in some degree, after many years of war, and consequent demoralization in countries that were the seat of war, (of which Dr. S. takes no account,) it would not be fair to attribute it, as Dr. S. does, to the change of faith or the want of religious care in the pastors. Several Englishmen, heads of families, who had resided some years in Geneva, and who were by no means partial to the Genevese Church, expressed to me, when I was there, their admiration of the correct state of morals in that city. It is true, an Englishman, a partisan of M. Malan, published a paper, in which he said the religious principles of the English youth were exposed to much danger in Geneva; but I believe the charge was generally felt by the English parents there, to be most unjust. W. C. Marsh, Esq., a respectable member of the English Church, thought it his duty publicly to refute the calumny. "Being myself" (says he) "the father of a family, I have had occasion to ascertain, that there is not any place of education, in which the morals of young people are less exposed to danger, or their religious principles less likely to be injured." This I believe to be strictly true. There may be irreligious or immoral men in Geneva: can Dr. S. name any town or religious community of which the same may not be predicated? Yet I may safely repeat here, what I have stated in my Travels—"There is a correct tone of moral feeling at Geneva, which would occasion any one to be coolly received in society, and even shunned, whatever were his wealth,

who was guilty of any great breach of moral duty." M. Malan, I believe, knew little of the state of society in other places, or of mankind generally, but from books, when he began to declaim against the Genevese. If we would estimate fairly the moral character of a people, we ought not to compare them with an imaginary community of saints, but with other people of the same period, and in the same state of civilization, and we ought to reside with both nations that we compare together.

When Dr. S. represents the increase of vice and profligacy and the relaxation of manners to be notoriously great in Geneva, I am compelled, from my knowledge of the contrary, to remind him "*that he writes from his own resources only,*" and that he would have done better, not to have relied on those resources, but to have made himself more certain of the facts. I repeat again, that until Dr. S. can name a single city in Europe of equal size and equally civilized, where there is less relaxation of manners, less vice and profligacy, less irreligion or blasphemy, than in Geneva, I must maintain that he has either written under great ignorance of the subject, or that he has brought forward an accusation against the Genevese, which is both unmerited and unjust, and this for no better reason, than that their religious creed does not agree with his own.

An anonymous writer in a review, trusting to his own resources, may, with a single dash of his pen, make what assertions he pleases, without fear of being responsible for their truth; thus the author of an article in the Eclectic Review, has boldly stated that what I have said in my Travels, of the persecuting spirit of Calvin and the Genevese Church, is false; he well knew that assertion was easier than proof, and he knew also that with a certain class of readers his assertion would pass current without examination. When a writer comes forward in his own name, to accuse or defend others, the case is different; he ought to be less confident in his accusations, unless he be prepared with his proofs; for some regard to truth is expected even from religious controversialists, if they fight under their own banners.

I believe the charge of irreligion is sometimes made against the Genevese by certain young Englishmen who visit that city soon after their arrival on the Continent, and who, from neglect in their education, have no idea of religion as an internal principle forming the rule of life, but consider the whole religious duty of man to consist in going to church at stated times, and in abstaining from cards and fox-hunting on a Sunday. Now, such persons seeing public and private amusements going on upon the Sunday evenings, conclude that the Genevese have no religion whatever. Sunday is regarded by the Genevese, as it is generally both by Catholics and Protestants on the Continent, as a day for religious worship and instruction, and for rest and relaxation also; and after the public services are over, tea parties, and public and private amusements commence. Without entering upon the question, whether the sabbatical observance of Sunday is commanded in the New Testament, I shall proceed to state, that in few cities on the Continent is Sunday so decently and religiously observed as at Geneva; the gates are closed during the hours of public worship, no carriages are allowed to pass, nor is it considered respectable to be seen in the streets at that time, except in cases of urgent necessity: after ten o'clock at night, profound silence generally prevails within the walls.

I shall not repeat what I have stated at some length in my Travels, respecting the great care taken of the religious education of the young persons of both sexes in Geneva, nor the interesting ceremony of their admission as members of the church, when they make a public profession of their faith, and partake of the Lord's Supper; but shall here quit this part of my reply to Dr. Smith's accusation. Should any of your readers think I have been too prolix, let them bear in mind the serious nature of the charge I am repelling. According to Dr. Smith, a departure from what he deems orthodoxy, is attended with a notorious increase of vice and infidelity, or, in other words, Unitarianism is the parent of demoralization and impiety. This is the plain inference from Dr. Smith's letters; but I deny

altogether the fact on which the inference is founded, and I challenge him to the proof. I deny, also, that the Genevese in the golden age of their orthodoxy, were the righteous people Dr. S. would have us to believe; but on the evidence of Bishop Burnet and contemporary writers, I have no hesitation in expressing my firm conviction, that they were greatly inferior in moral virtue to the Genevese of the present day.

The other parts of Dr. Smith's accusation respecting the conduct of the Genevese Pastors to M. Malan, I intend to form the subject of a second letter, in which I hope to shew that Dr. S. has written from very imperfect data, and has hence greatly misrepresented their case. The principal cause of blame rests not in the conduct of the Pastors, but in the ancient constitution and combination of Church and State. From the establishment of the Reformation in Geneva to the present day, the principles of religious toleration have never been fully adopted in that city; indeed, for more than a century after the Dictatorship of Calvin, Geneva was the very sink of intolerance: no religious worship but that of the Genevese Church was allowed to be performed even in private houses! So deeply and permanently did the intolerant spirit of Calvinism pervade the civil as well as the religious institutions, that if the permission to worship publicly has afterwards been granted by the Republic to some other sects, it has always been conceded not as a right, but as a special favour, revocable at the option of the government. I except the Catholic population recently united to Geneva by treaty, to which the liberty of worship would be of course guaranteed. We may pity the Genevese for not having emancipated themselves entirely from the remaining chains of orthodox intolerance: it is but justice, however, to say, that few places on the Continent can boast of possessing more religious freedom than this little Republic. Excessive caution has always been the character of the Genevese Government; and surrounded as it nearly is, by powerful and not friendly states, we need not wonder that the dread of internal divisions has made the magistrates jealous of the introduction

of religious opinions, at variance with those of their Established Church.

I cannot blame the Genevese Pastors for removing M. Malan from their community; it was scarcely possible for them to do otherwise; but if they have in any way since obstructed him in the free exercise of public worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, I am willing they should receive all the blame they may merit. That the Genevese Pastors were not blamable for removing M. Malan from their community, and that they exercised towards him great patience and forbearance, I think even Dr. Smith must admit, when he impartially reflects upon all the circumstances. Every religious society has the right to make by general consent such regulations as may be deemed necessary for its own government, to which all who continue in the society are bound to adhere. The Church of Geneva thought proper to prohibit the introduction of certain disputed doctrines into discourses from the pulpit; or, if the introduction were unavoidable, it required that the preacher should confine himself to scripture language. M. Malan, disregarding these regulations, not only made those doctrines the principal subject of his discourses, but represented all who did not believe them in his own manner, as unworthy the name of Christians. What would Dr. Smith say, were a preacher among the Independents or Methodists to declare in his discourses that all his brethren in the ministry were in a state of deplorable and damnable error; that the doctrine of the Trinity was false, and all who believed in it were idolaters and had no hope of salvation? Surely Dr. S. must admit, that if after being remonstrated with mildly again and again, the minister still persisted in preaching against the Trinity, and in calling his brethren idolaters and enemies of the gospel, they would be imperiously obliged to expel him—“A house divided against itself cannot stand.”—Now, *mutato nomine*, this is exactly the case of M. Malan and the Church of Geneva.

Dr. Smith says that “M. Chenevière and his *ruthless associates*,” the Pastors of Geneva, have done all in their power to plunge M. Malan, that good

man, and his family, into a state of the deepest poverty, into utter destitution, and he is very angry at M. C. for saying the gates of fortune are thrown open to M. Malan;—the assertion is nevertheless true. I am far from believing that M. Malan was influenced by mercenary motives to dissent from the Church of Geneva; but there is much reason to conclude, from his vacillating conduct, that we should have heard nothing of his dissent, had he not been strongly urged on by a zealous and opulent party in this country. This party has not only made him liberal presents, but has induced many British parents to send their sons to be educated by him on very high terms. He had, when I was at Geneva, eight or nine pupils, who paid, as I was informed, each 200 Napoleons per annum, or about £160 sterling: now, with these terms, and the Genevese style of living, he could scarcely gain less than £900 clear profit each year, a sum which he could hardly have realized in thirty years, from the small salary of which he was deprived, as a minister of the Genevese Church. That the pupils were sent to M. Malan on account of his religious opinions, I offer his own testimony in proof. I was one morning seated with Mr. Rooke, the respectable clergyman of the English Church at Geneva, when M. Malan opened the door; he retired on seeing Mr. R. engaged, but the next day he waited upon him again, when the following dialogue took place:—M. Malan—“I come, Mr. Rooke, to inquire what are your religious opinions as a minister of the Church of England, on certain doctrinal subjects; a Scotch lady, Mrs. M—t—d, has placed her son under my care, but she is not willing that he should attend the English Church, unless she is certain that your religious belief is the same as my own.”—Mr. R. “I have no objection to answer your inquiries as far as I am able.”—M. M. “Well, then, to save time, I will first ask you, Mr. Rooke, whether you are fully assured of your own salvation?”—Mr. R. “No, indeed, I am not, and I should deem it presumptuous to believe that I was. I consider the Christian life as a state of trial and warfare, and that we cannot be assured of our

own safety till the trial is over.” M. M. “I see we differ essentially; I am quite certain of my own salvation, and I believe every true Christian ought to be so.”—From this difference M. Malan said the young gentleman could not, conformably to his mother's instructions, attend the services of Mr. Rooke in the English Church; and they parted with much civility to each other, M. M. concluding with, “I dare say, Mr. Rooke, you may think me over zealous, *trop exalté*, and I may think that you are deficient in zeal.” The conversation took place in the French language, but was substantially as I have given it; and as it was intended to be a protest of M. Malan's difference from the faith of the English Church, there can be no impropriety in making it public. I have not the slightest unfriendly feeling to M. Malan, and I am sincerely glad that he has found what he conceives to be the path of duty leads to a handsome competency; his opposition to the regular clergy may do much good, for the energies of public bodies, as well as of individuals, (to use an expression of Dr. Johnson's,) grow stagnant, without external ventilation. M. Malan would, however, do well to preach what he believes to be the truth firmly, without stopping by the way to anathematize those who differ from him. I confess M. Malan's doctrine of Final Perseverance, or, that “when a man is become a chosen vessel, one of the elect, he cannot afterwards fall from salvation, whatever crimes he may commit,” appears to me more likely to encourage presumption and spiritual pride, than the Christian virtue of humility; nor can I see how the moral conduct of the Genevese would be improved by adopting it. I trust they are too enlightened to return to the intolerant principles of Calvin; they may, however, derive consolation and benefit from looking back on the gloomy and galling superstition from which they have escaped. In my next, I purpose to examine Dr. J. P. Smith's charges more particularly.

ROBERT BAKEWELL.

[To be continued.]

Dr. J. Pye Smith in Reply to Professor Chenevière, on the late Theological Controversies at Geneva.

(Concluded from p. 474.)

Homerton,

Sir,

Sept. 10, 1824.

TO trespass a fourth time on your indulgence and the patience of your readers, is an unwelcome task. That I may not exceed proper limits, I fear that I must use more of assertion, and introduce less of evidence, than will be agreeable to me: but necessity is laid upon me; and, if any of your correspondents should require the proofs of any part of my statements not already so fortified, I shall be happy to answer the call.

VII. *M. Curtat*, one of the clergy of Lausanne. M. Chenevière styles him *Dean (Doyen)*, an academical title, as I believe, and not ecclesiastical. From M. C.'s declamatory paragraph it appears that this gentleman plumes himself upon something which he calls orthodoxy, and that he has, in some way, denounced or protested against his Genevese neighbours.—What he has done I know not, nor am I concerned to vindicate him or his measures. I have been informed that he and his associates hold the Deity of Christ, while, in other respects, they are at different degrees on the scale of doctrinal Pelagianism and practical formalism: but we cannot forget that truth is despoiled of its excellency, if it be “held in unrighteousness,” if it be degraded to be the badge of a party, if it be maintained in the spirit of rivalry and hostility. A century ago, M. de Crousaz (who died in 1748, a man certainly of great literary merit) did that for lowering the standard of religion in the Pays de Vaud, which Ostervald did in the west of Switzerland, Werenfels in the north, and Alphonsus Turrettin at Geneva. Mr. Gibbon says of him, “His divinity had been formed in the school of Limborth and Leclerc; in a long and laborious life, several generations of pupils were taught to think, and even to write; his lessons rescued the Academy of Lausanne from *Calvinistic prejudices.*” (*Miscellaneous Works, published by Lord Sheffield*; I. 58, 4to ed.) Mr. Gibbon knew well how

to appreciate such services. Of one of the ministers of the following generation, M. Allamand, Pastor of Bex, he writes, “He is one of the finest geniuses that I know.—Philosophy is the subject which he has the most deeply studied.—Unknown to fame, and discontented with mankind.—He is a country-parson, who gulls the clowns.—He had some measures to keep: and I much suspect that he never shewed me the true colours of his secret scepticism.” (II. 266, and I. 71.) This language cannot be mistaken. We know what was the historian's *philosophy*; how he had learned to *keep measures*; and what example he set, in his own works, of literary integrity. The tendency of such a state of things as here met his encomiums, is easily perceived: nor is it difficult to calculate what must have been the effect, in sixty or eighty years, upon the religion of the Church and the Academy. Of late, however, piety has begun to revive in the Pays de Vaud. A respectable number of the suffragan ministers, (who hold a rank resembling that of curates in the Church of England,) some of the parochial clergy, and not a few of pious and intelligent people in different parts of the Canton, have manifested a zeal and attention to religion similar to that at Geneva: and this has been accompanied with a return to the old theology. M. Curtat and a powerful majority of the clergy have first vilified these good people, by gross misrepresentation of their doctrines and attacks upon their character; and then have prevailed with the Government of their Republic to commence against them a persecution which, if I had space to detail the particulars, your enlightened readers would say was worthy of Madrid or Lisbon. Here the Council of State of Geneva appears in a very honourable contrast with that of Lausanne. The former, after having proceeded with apparently extreme jealousy, caution and reserve, has ended by nobly protecting the Dissenters under its jurisdiction. The latter has meanly lent itself to the mad intolerance of the ruling party of Pastors and Professors. On Jan. 15th last, it published a decree prohibiting, under the penalty of severe fines and imprison-

ment, all meetings for religious worship or instruction other than those of the Established Church. On the following day, a circular letter was issued to the officers of government throughout the Canton, enjoining a rigorous enforcement of the cruel and detestable decree. This document, in the true style of Jesuitical hypocrisy, declares, that the Council does not at all pretend to enter into theological discussions, or to disturb men's consciences, or to meddle with the religious opinions of individuals, or "to restrain the liberty of THINKING" (ni de gène la liberté de la pensée). This has been followed by another decree, in May, which denounces fines, imprisonment, or banishment, upon the most private kind of religious assembly, or even the admission of a single visitor to family worship. Dean Curtat is known to be a primary mover in these almost incredible measures. I feel no disinclination to commend him to the tender mercies of Professor Chenevière.

VIII. *M. Pierre Méjanel.* I esteem it an honour to call this Christian minister my friend. He is a native of the South of France, where his father is the pastor of a Protestant church. He was educated in the Colleges of Montauban and Lausanne, and was, in due time, appointed either assistant minister or copastor in the church at the former place. Upon the second restoration of Louis XVIII. he was ejected (*destitué*) from his station. I never thought it advisable to inquire into the reason of this act of the royal and paternal government, not doubting but that both the act and the motive were *worthy of a son of St. Louis*. Some other Protestant ministers in France, at the same time, received similar kind messages. It was sufficient for my satisfaction, that I could not perceive that this circumstance, though it deprived my friend of his means of temporal subsistence, at all diminished the apparent esteem and cordiality of the most respectable Protestants, in Paris and other places. Neither, I am still more happy to say, has this part of his history prevented his officiating very frequently, as an occasional minister, in many parts of France. But he has been appointed to no other pastoral charge. In the Protestant churches, the people elect,

or the consistory nominate; but the confirmation of the appointment lies with the king.

M. M. spent half a year at Geneva, in 1817 and 1818, discharging the public and private duties of a Christian minister, in connexion with the Dissenting congregation to be mentioned in the next article. In January 1818, he was verbally directed by the Lieutenant of Police to quit the Canton, after a few days which would be granted him for his personal convenience. He requested to know the reasons of this mandate, and the law upon which it was founded. This was refused him, and the same evening he received a written and formal order to quit the territory of the Republic in twenty-four hours. Imprudently, as I humbly think, he wrote a letter of remonstrance to the Lieutenant of Police, and declaring that he would yield only to a forcible expulsion. Yet I cannot but admire the simplicity and integrity of his mind, in this proceeding. He said, in his letter, "Ever since I came to Geneva, my occupation has been to preach the word of God; to exhort children to obedience, grown men to temperance, righteousness and piety, the aged to patience, the dying to the hope of heaven, and all to faith in Christ." Notwithstanding this rather irritating conduct, the Government shewed more forbearance than could have been reasonably expected. They suffered three or four days to elapse, and then sent M. M. to the frontier, under an escort of gendarmes.

M. C. makes no allusion to these facts: a pretty strong proof that M. M.'s conduct, during the few months of his residence at Geneva, was both morally and legally irreproachable. The general opinion was that the clergy were besieging the government with complaints and solicitations; and that it was judged advisable to gratify them by expelling an alien, while it was determined, but not yet clearly avowed, to protect their own citizens in the measures of peaceable dissent. M. C.'s charges against M. M. are three. (Mon. Repos. p. 8.)

1. That "in 1818 he wrote against the Pastors."—M. M., with his characteristic openness, very soon after his arrival at Geneva, printed and sent round to the Pastors a letter of five

quarto pages, dated August 18, 1817. It is elegantly drawn up, and devoted almost solely to the inculcating of tolerance, charity and good temper towards persons who differ in religious opinions. It is an absolute misrepresentation to say that it is "*against* the *pastors*." It is *against* no one: it is merely a pleading against the *principle* of persecution, and in defence of universal religious freedom: and it is throughout in the most respectful style of address. I venture to say that, were the whole of it to be inserted, it would give universal pleasure to your readers, and would do honour to the pages of the *Monthly Repository*: but I will request admittance for only a few paragraphs.

" — To write or speak against differing opinions is not hostility. Such contests, when conducted with honour and integrity, are innocent: yea, more, they are noble and highly to be commended; and their issue, sooner or later, must be the triumph of truth.—I would expose myself to be smitten by both parties,—[in protesting against]—encroachments of any kind committed against liberty of conscience, the right of judging for one's self of the truths contained in the word of God, the right of expressing to others the sincere opinions which we form.—The oppression which aims to shut the mouth of an adversary, in order to get a cheap and worthless victory, is nothing else than tyranny; it is a criminal war against both God and man; it is the very ravaging of the church of Christ; it is the greatest obstacle that can possibly be opposed to the progress of Christians towards those days of knowledge, peace and prosperity, which shall certainly be at last enjoyed.—Each party ought to say to its opposite, We want not to be your judges, any more than we admit you to be ours: preach your doctrine; we will preach that which is agreeable to our judgment and conscience; and God will prosper what he approves.—You are divided in opinion, but be united in charity.—This harmony of hearts—will bring on happy times."

2. That M. M. "has gone from place to place doing mischief." Such general charges certainly are out of the reach of reply. Let M. C. say what he means, and I have no doubt

but that M. M. will meet him in a manly and candid manner.

3. That "he was condemned, some months ago, to fine and imprisonment by a French tribunal, for having in various places set parishioners against their *pastors*, and turned them to Methodism." Any of your readers, Sir, from Cornwall to Caithness, will in a moment see how to translate this into plain English. But it might appear a disregard to impartiality, if I were to withhold the facts alluded to. Few need to be informed that the enjoyment of religious *freedom* by Protestants in France is, in practice, far inferior to the *toleration* of our country. My esteemed friend Méjanel is pious, amiable, upright, well-informed, and an engaging preacher, and he is not habitually imprudent: but I do not believe that he regards extreme caution, which, perhaps, some of the best of men would call worldly wisdom, as a cardinal virtue. In the spring of 1823, at a village in the department of the Aisne, he conducted some religious services without observing the restrictions of the law as to place and the number of hearers. In so doing he gave offence to a neighbouring Protestant pastor. For this he was prosecuted, and condemned by the first tribunal to three months' imprisonment and a fine of 200 francs. He appealed to the next higher court, which was held at Laon; and this repealed the sentence of imprisonment, but confirmed the fine. The barristers, almost if not quite unanimously, maintained that the lower court was in error, and that the law had not been violated: and the Judges and the King's Attorney treated M. M. with marked respect. The whole proceedings made a remarkably favourable impression, through a very extensive and populous district; and the Protestant minister who had taken a part in the prosecution, very shortly after manifested a friendly disposition.

Now, I request the reader to judge of the integrity and candour of M. Chenevière's insinuations.

IX. *The New Church*, as it is called; or the Society formed in 1817, upon the simple principle of the New Testament, a voluntary and congregational union for celebrating the ordinances of Christian worship and instruction. M. C. admits that these

Dissenters have "given an example of integrity" by their open secession: but he also affirms that their "heads—have put out several pieces with the same intention," of depreciating the Established Church, and that their conduct has been "indecorous and blameable."

To the account already given of this Congregational Church, (pp. 405—407,) I need not add much. It has two pastors, M. Æmilius Guers and M. Empaytaz. M. Gonthier, one of its first pastors, finished a short, but holy and useful, course in January 1823. From personal knowledge of him and M. Guers, I feel myself greatly honoured in having an opportunity of bearing testimony to their intellectual and moral characters, their acquirements in literature and theology, their scriptural piety and zeal, their noble disinterestedness, and the hard and painful sacrifices which they made to their honest convictions. The members of this church are partly Pædobaptist and partly of the opposite persuasion; but they can maintain purity and harmony, without rigid uniformity. They make no terms of communion but the evidence of sincere religion, and acknowledge no ecclesiastical regulations but those of the New Testament. Their place of worship is a part of a private building, fitted up as they have been able, and much too small for their congregation. I have been assured by persons worthy of credit, that, had they a sufficient place of meeting, they would probably have a thousand attendants. But, in a walled and densely built city it is scarcely possible to obtain building-ground, and only at a tremendous price. It would be worthy of the liberality and munificence of the Council of State to grant them the use of one of the churches, at hours when it is not used by the old congregation. Such a boon would injure no one; it would be only similar to the joint use of the same church which, in some parts of Switzerland, (as I have read,) is enjoyed by Protestants and Catholics; and it is well merited by a moral and exemplary body of Christians whom a wise and generous government will soon learn to appreciate.

I know of no publications from the members of this church which can fall under M. C.'s censure. Perhaps

M. Bost may be one of their number; of his pamphlet I have given some information before. (P. 473.) Nothing could be more cruelly unjust than to represent, as in any way disrespectful, the *Address* of this church, cited in p. 406. That would be, indeed, to realize the fable of the wolf and the lamb. Neither can I say anything about the charge of "indecorous and blameable conduct," except, that it is contrary to all my conceptions of probability, and that, in the absence of all evidence, I cannot believe it.

X. *M. Cæsar Malan.* I must content myself with a most imperfect notice of this excellent man; or I should transgress all reasonable limits. M. Chenevière has occupied twenty-two columns in aspersing him: but, to any serious person who will impartially reflect, I think that the tenor of those pages will furnish its own antidote. I must also request the candid reader to turn to pp. 323, 324, 405—409, of this volume.

In the Established Church of Geneva there are about 25 *pastors*, who serve the five churches of the city, according to a system of rotation. These, with the country pastors of the Canton, constitute the *Venerable Company*; and, with the addition of some *Lay-Elders* and *Government-Officers*, they form the *Consistory*. (I request the reader thus to make correct a clause in page 324.) There is also a class, whether limited in number or not I do not know, called *Ministers*. These are young men who have gone through the eight or nine years of study in the Academy, have received the honourable testimonials of the Professors, and have been approved and **ORDAINED** by the Company. These are called upon to preach as circumstances require; and are promoted to vacancies in the pastorsehip, as they occur. Of this class was M. Malan. He was also one of the *Regents*, or *Tutors*, of the College. Till 1815 or 1816 his religious views resembled those of the majority of his clerical brethren; his eloquence procured him admiration in the pulpit; and his high order of accomplishments made him a favourite in the literary and polished circles. Serious reflection, the conversation of Dr. Mason of New York, and of Mr. Haldane, and the devout study of the New Testament, were the

means which operated a gradual, but at length very decided, change in his religious sentiments and affections, and in his entire character. This change, of necessity, was indicated by his preaching; and the impression, favourable and unfavourable, which it made upon the public mind was very great. Other events coincided to increase that impression. The declining of MM. Gonthier and Guers to continue in the Establishment, when they had finished most honourably their academical course; the formation of the Dissenting Church; the various other circumstances detailed in these papers; and the rekindled vigour of a respectable minority in the pastorate, in preaching the doctrines of the New Testament; all concurred to stimulate the feelings of all classes. The citizens of Geneva may be called one family. They almost universally know, and take a lively interest in, the affairs of each other. Neutrality is difficult and hardly possible. It scarcely needs to be said that opponents were far more numerous than favourites and friends. The lowest vulgar shewed their propensities by assaults and horrid outcries. The paragraph-writers for the Paris newspapers sent flippant statements, full of that misrepresentation which is produced by ignorance when coupled with malevolence. The majority of the clergy acted as Lord Clarendon says that description of persons usually do act, when thrown into critical and delicate conjunctures of affairs; with great bustle, but with very little moderation or wisdom. The Supreme Authorities of the Republic, during this difficult and anxious period, appear to have conducted themselves in a manner which entitles them to much praise. If, in two or three instances, they yielded too much to the importunities of the powerful and vindictive party, great consideration is due to the perplexing and untried circumstances in which they were placed. But, all things considered, they acted with prudence and some liberality.

The Company then published their *Regulation* of May 3, 1817, (see p. 5, of this vol.) in one point of view an artful snare; in another, a flagrant invasion of natural right, of common sense, of justice, and of religion. M. Malan long declined to submit to this

preposterous requirement. At last, by importunities and softening explanations, he was prevailed upon to sign it; for which he afterwards severely blamed himself. M. C. charges him with insincerity in this action. (P. 66.) The facts of the case, even according to M. C.'s own representation, do not appear to me to sustain this accusation. Had M. Malan acted from such a motive, the probability is, that he would have quietly sat down and enjoyed the fruits of duplicity. Abundant examples and venerable sanction for such conduct were not far for him to seek. But I believe, upon satisfactory grounds, that, unnerved in the first place by parental and by still more tender pleadings, he was induced by persons who, perhaps, felt more for his temporal interests than he himself did, to confide in the Company's admitting such an explication of the *Règlement* as would only prohibit discussions on abstruse points, which he had never any inclination to bring into the pulpit; and that his characteristic style of awakening addresses, on the necessity of faith, repentance and holiness, would not be construed into a violation of the engagement. I think this the more probable, as the copy of the *Règlement* which I received about that time differs from that given by M. C. precisely in this very way. I could preach, fully and freely, my Calvinistic sentiments, without intrenching upon what *might seem* to be the sense of the first and third restrictions, as first published. M. C. tells us how this difference happened (Mon. Repos. pp. 5 and 6 of this vol.): and also says that the Regulation "did not oppose the publication of theological doctrines, either in writing, without reserve; or in the pulpit, if there explained *briefly* and *mildly*, and when the subject *led to them*." It does not appear, however, that the Venerable Company gave to those for whom they legislated, any instrument for measuring the quantity and quality of the said explications. M. Malan soon found, to his cost, that the allowance was subject to no definite rule, and that the whole was a trap which arbitrary power could use at its pleasure. In consequence of his subscription, he was allowed to preach. He delivered, I think, two sermons: and then the

Company issued their order to forbid him the use of any pulpit. It is impossible for me to give any information upon the character of these sermons. If I might judge of them by the analogy of those discourses of M. Malan which I have read, I should say that they were luminous, tender, awakening, discriminating, evangelical and practical, in a high degree: but to say that his sermons (so far as I have read or heard any of them) contain arrogant denunciations, discussions on the subject of Predestination, or assertions of "the inutility of good works," would be grossly untrue. But this is not the ground which I take. I must repeat the position laid down in my first letter, that M. Malan had *the same right* to preach his religious sentiments that his opponents had to preach theirs. I may even go farther, and assert that, *upon their principles* as a Church-Establishment, he had a *much greater* right; for his doctrines are no other than those of their own original Confessions, which, if the regulation of J. A. Turrettin, of 1706, be still in force, (see p. 409 of this vol.,) they have engaged *not to oppose*. But, even if that regulation has been abolished, surely M. Malan might, with good reason, have pleaded, that the doctrines of all the Reformers, the doctrines on which the Church of Geneva was founded, and which were its solemn profession till a comparatively recent period, should not be *the only ones* proscribed; while, in all other respects, the most free-thinking excursions are encouraged.

The next step of these indefatigable persecutors was to eject M. Malan from his situation as one of the Tutors in the College, which was effected in November 1818. M. C. passes this over in a few lines, full of inequitable representation. (P. 65 of this vol.) He makes two accusations.

I. That M. M. "had given disturbance to the Inspectors of the College, by the nature of his religious instructions, and on that account they had withdrawn from him the confidence he no longer merited."—The complaints against M. M. were the following:

1. That he had published a small volume of Latin Poetry, for the use of his pupils, without Academical authority. M. M. replied that he had

submitted the manuscript to the Principal, who kept it three weeks, and then gave express permission that it might be printed.

2. That he had introduced THE BIBLE into the religious instruction of his class. He replied that he had not done this without what he believed to be sufficient permission from a superior in the College; that he adapted the use of the Scriptures to the standing and capacity of his pupils; and that he had received various testimonies of satisfaction with his plan.

3. That he made changes in the Catechism. He answered that the allegation was untrue, that he taught the Catechism wholly and without alteration, but that he felt it an indispensable duty to supply its defects and fill up its generalities, in his lectures, by more ample developements of religious truths and duties from the Scriptures; and that, in all this, he acted according to the rules of the College, and the practice of the other Regents.

4. That he introduced into his lectures the most abstruse, difficult and controvertible points in theology, altogether above the capacities of his pupils. This he positively denied. He affirmed that he never endeavoured to make his scholars disputants, to load their minds with scholastic subtleties, or to harass their consciences with superstitious scruples and vain terrors; but, in the midst of their intellectual labours, never to neglect the one thing needful, the education of their souls, their eternal salvation. He said that he had taught his pupils, to the best of his judgment, nothing unsuitable to their capacities and attainments; that he had laid before them, in scriptural simplicity, the ruin of man by sin, salvation by the grace of God through Jesus Christ, and the indispensable necessity of gratitude and universal obedience; and that, with respect to the particular accusation of introducing the doctrine of Predestination, he had carefully avoided it, conceiving it to be a doctrine proper to be delivered only to persons who had made considerable progress in the knowledge of Christianity, and in a devout submission to the authority and grace of God.

This is a bare outline of M. Malan's

replies, but I have endeavoured to preserve his own expressions. The Venerable Company was inexorable. It required of him an engagement to confine his religious instructions to the servile repetition of the words of the Catechism, and gave him fifteen days for consideration. He appealed, by a respectful memorial, to the Council of State; but in vain. During this distressing fortnight, he had to sustain the remonstrances of his superiors in rank and office, the pressing intreaties of his friends, and the heart-rending pleadings of those most dear to him. The fortnight elapsed; and on Nov. 6, 1818, the Council of State declared his place vacant.

I have derived these particulars from the *Pièces relatives à la Destitution du Ministre Malan*, containing the correspondence on both sides, without any comment. But, with regard to this publication,

II. M. Chenevière charges M. Malan with "concealing that which was most to the purpose, the Extract from the Records of the Council of State, declaring that he had been deprived of his office for insubordination to his superiors." So far as I can judge of this matter, it appears that M. C. takes advantage of a mere inadvertency, to advance a very harsh, not to say cruel, accusation. I find at p. 52, M. Malan's request to the President of the Company, for a copy of the charge (Préavis) submitted to the Council, and of the definitive sentence. Then follows the answer of the Secretary, informing him that the Company would permit him to *read* the Extract from the Registers, but that it belonged to the Council alone to grant a copy; and that the charge presented to the Council was part of the correspondence between the two bodies, and not allowed to be communicated to any individual. To these two letters the following note is annexed by M. M.: "I have also requested of the Secretary of State an extract from the Registers of the Noble Council, concerning my dismissal; and it was soon sent me." Now to me it appears probable that this extract was an official document of two or three lines, not essential to the narrative; though I think it ought to have been inserted. But I can

reasonably imagine no dishonourable motive for the omission; and as for the alleged crime of insubordination, it would be absurd to charge him with an inclination to suppress it, for it is plentifully made in other papers of the same pamphlet.

M. Chenevière occupies nine pages more (pp. 67—75) in his vituperation of M. Malan. But I cannot allow myself to trespass upon your kindness, by offering detailed remarks upon them. At p. 68, are eight formal charges. The 6th *I know* to be false, both in letter and spirit: and besides, how inaccurate, to say the least, is it to represent M. M. as "distinguishing persons by the name of *Momiers*," when that is the offensive and insulting appellation which his enemies have invented or revived, for the purpose of vilifying him and other pious people! The 8th is merely a constructive offence, and which might be laid against the most innocent person in the world. The remaining six describe acts and proceedings which every Dissenting Minister in Great Britain does, and feels it to be his duty and honour to do, so far as the circumstances are analogous. With regard to all the rest of M. C.'s statements, I desire no other justification of my friend than that opinion which you, Sir, and all your dispassionate readers must pronounce, *upon the accuser's own shewing*. I appeal to any man who has but a moderate acquaintance with the rights of human nature, whether the treatment of M. Malan by the Ecclesiastical power has been any other than a constant course of **INJUSTICE, CRUELTY, and TYRANNY.**

I feel deeply indebted to you for having allowed me to occupy so many pages of the Repository; far indeed beyond what I at first intended, yet much less than I should have to write if I were to pursue into all their turns and windings, the subterfuge, perversion, oppression, and persecution which have been resorted to by those whom I have very reluctantly felt myself compelled, from a sense of duty to the cause of integrity and liberty, thus to hold up in their proper colours.

J. PYE SMITH.

Notes on Passages of Scripture.

Sept. 2, 1824.

— quemadmodum Vina quæ sub primam calcationem molliter defluunt, sunt suaviora quam quæ a torculari exprimuntur (quoniam hæc ex acino et cuto uvae aliquid sapient), similiter salubres admodum ac suaves sunt doctrinæ quæ ex Scripturis leniter expressis emanant, nec ad controversias aut locos communes trahuntur.

BACON.

1 Chron. xvi. 15. “ **B**E ye mindful always,” &c. In Ps. cv. 8, “ He hath remembered his covenant,” &c. Long before I met with a note in Hallett’s Discourses, &c. (II. 69), I had conjectured, that the passage in the Chronicles should be corrected to that in the Psalms. The emendation may be made with the greatest ease. But then there is an entire absence of external testimony in its favour. On the other hand, it appears (Kennicott and De Rossi, in loc.), that the clause in the Psalms has, in some few MSS., been corrected from the text of the historian.

A most ingenious conjecture of Hallett’s, on Neh. ix. 17, (Vol. II. 9, 10,) where, for the words *in their rebellion*, he proposes to read, *in Egypt*, has received subsequently a sanction additional to that of the LXX. See Kennicott, De Rossi, and Houbigant, in loc.

Job vii. 1, (xiv. 14,) “ Is there not an appointed time (in the margin, a *warfare*) to man?” &c. Dathe translates the word by *statio admodum molestæ*, and refers specifically to Num. iv. 3, 43. But I cannot be of opinion that the original term necessarily conveys the idea of any thing harassing and vexatious. I would render it “ a [regular and prescribed] service.” The expression was perhaps in the first instance *military*, and was afterwards transferred to ecclesiastical and civil life.

It must be admitted, however, that Dathe is by no means singular in his interpretation. Scott, whose paraphrase, “ an appointed time of affliction,” clearly indicates his view of the Hebrew noun, cites Dan. x. 1; though the passage is nothing to his purpose. See Dan. xii. 4. The rendering in Cranmer’s Great Bible, is curious; partly accurate, but in part grossly

erroneous, “ Hath man ANY CERTAIN TIME upon earth?” In Num. iv. 3, 23, &c., Mr. Wellbeloved, with his accustomed care and judgment, has “ the service.”

Ps. lxxxiv. 9. “ Behold, O God, our shield,” &c. Translators and Commentators are divided in respect of the rendering and import of this clause. According to some, Jehovah is here styled the Shield, or Guardian, of the Jewish people; an interpretation countenanced, at least, if not required and suggested, by the eleventh verse. Others are of opinion, that David is now spoken of as the shield of his subjects; that “ our shield” and “ thine anointed” are one and the same individual. This is a very plausible exposition; if it be not indeed quite correct. Dathe objects to it, that David (assuming him to be the author of the Psalm) employs throughout the singular number: “ *At* enim vero obstare videtur numerus pluralis, cum in toto Psalmo David de se in numero singulari loquatur.” What, nevertheless, if the Psalm were written, and actually used, in parts; if some portions of it were put into the mouth of a chief singer, or leader, while the others proceeded from a *chorus*? There is nothing improbable, but the reverse, * in such a view of the poem before us: and if we can with justness adopt this opinion, Dathe’s reasoning will fall instantly to the ground. Mendelssohn, who divides the Psalm in the manner which I have represented, translates the words in question,

“ Schaue auf unser Schild, Gott!
Sieh’ auf deinen Gesalbten.”

Matt. ii. 1. “ When Jesus was born in Bethlehem, of Judea, in the days of Herod the King,” &c. The highly respectable author of “ An Introduction to the Geography of the New Testament,” says (5th edit. 33), that “ Herod died three or four years before the commencement of the Christian æra.” I presume he means, that, according to Lardner’s accurate statement, (Works, 1788, Vol. I. 428,) “ if Herod died in 750, he died three years and nine months before the vulgar Christian æra, which com-

* See Street’s arrangement and note, in loc.

mences January 1, A. U. 754." This distinction is essential.

By the authors of "L'Art de vérifier les Dates" the birth of Christ is placed in the year of Rome 748 (3d ed., Vol. I. 98): and Mr. Mann,* who wrote a Dissertation expressly on the subject, assigns Herod's death to 750, and our Saviour's birth to 748. Such a coincidence of opinion between the Master of the Charterhouse and the learned Benedictines to whom I have just referred, is extremely memorable.

I shall not conclude this note, without remarking on a passage in Tertullian, (adv. Marcion. IV. Ch. iv.,) which has frequently been cited by the oppugners of the authenticity of the introductory chapters in the several gospels of Luke and Matthew. "Finis ergo ducendus est contentio. pari hinc inde nisu fluctuante. Ego meum dico verum, Marcion suum. Ego Marcionis adfirmo adulteratum, Marcion meum. Quis inter nos determinabit, &c.?" Thus much, and no more, has generally been transcribed, from this chapter in Tertullian, by the writers to whom I have alluded. But they should not have stopped here. The African father expressly claims to have antiquity and current reception in his favour; nor was the question, whose copy of Luke was genuine—Marcion's or Tertullian's—a simply personal question. "Quis inter nos determinabit, nisi temporis ratio, ei prescribens autoritatem, quod antiquius reperiatur, et ei praejudicantis vitiacionem, quod posterius revineatur? In quantum enim falsum corruptio est veri, in tantum praecedat necesse est veritas falsum." Afterwards he says, "that his [Ter-

* Of Nicholas Mann some account is given in the Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century, (Vol. II. 165, 705, &c.): and we would gladly have known more. On looking into the Catalogue of Cambridge Graduates, I find "Nic. Mann," of King's College, who took his Bachelor of Arts' degree in 1703, and his Master's, in 1707. The two Dissertations before me—the one, on the true year of the birth, the other, on that of the death of Christ—appeared, together, in English, in 1733; in Latin, in 1742. Mr. Mann was no slave to human systems of literature, science and theology.

tullian's] own copy was the more ancient, because Marcion himself did for some time receive it."*

So far as Tertullian and Marcion were concerned *individually*, the matter in dispute could not with readiness be settled. Their respective *assertions* determined nothing. Tertullian proceeds, accordingly, to employ *arguments*, of the force of which his readers will form a judgment.

John xx. 31. "These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name." Such was the object of all the evangelists, and not of John only, in drawing up memoirs of their Master. Their design, however, and their manner of accomplishing it, have been mistaken. Less† represents Eusebius as giving the following information, from a work of Clement of Alexandria, in respect to John, "that he had written πνευματικον ευαγγελιον, a gospel which treated especially of the divine nature of Christ, the others being principally employed on his human." Τοι * * Ιωαννη εσχατον συνιδούτα, δι τα σωματικα εν τοις ευαγγελιοις δεδηλωται, προτραπευτα οπο των γνωριμων, πνευματικη διευφροθευτα, πνευματικον ποιησαι ευαγγελιον.

What is there concerning the divine or even the human nature of Christ in the words thus quoted? It is not Clement, it is not Eusebius, but Less, who introduces these topics, and makes this unwarrantable distinction between John and the rest of the evangelists. Take Lardner's‡ more faithful, though not faultless, rendering of the passage—"John, observing that in the other gospels those things were related that concerned the body [of Christ], and, being persuaded by his friends, and also moved by the spirit of God, wrote a spiritual gospel."

By σωματικα are intended *things corporeal, things falling under the report of the senses, and connected with the senses*: a spiritual gospel, πνευματικον ευαγγελιον, is a gospel

* Priestley's Hist. of Early Opinions, &c. IV. 104.

† Authenticity of the New Testament, &c. 147.

‡ Works, (1788,) II. 212.

which treats largely of things invisible and abstract. The distinction corresponds with what our Saviour himself takes (John iii. 12) between earthly and heavenly things. Accordingly, the gospel written by the beloved disciple records more of the discourses than of the actions of Christ—and discourses that were purposely and highly figurative. In this signification it is, exactly what Clement of Alexandria terms it, “a spiritual gospel.”

Acts ii. 23. “Him being DELIVERED by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God,” &c. Bishop Pearce’s Commentary here is, “Greek, *having been given forth*; i. e. sent into the world, and manifested by being *made flesh, and dwelling among you*, as it is said in John i. 14. See also Acts iv. 28.” Now this translation and paraphrase are inadmissible. The word *εκδοτος* bears no such sense as the learned prelate affixes to it: and Peter is now speaking exclusively of his Master’s having been delivered up to the Jews; of which measure Judas Iscariot was the instrument. Schleusner (in verb.) renders the clause exceedingly well: “hunc, vobis traditum et proditum a Juda, comprehendistis.”

Acts ii. 41. “Then they that gladly received his word were baptized.” In the received text of the Greek Testament it is, *οι μεν εν ασμενως αποδεξαμενοι, κ. τ. λ.* But Griesbach marks the adverb *ασμενως* with the sign of probable omission: and we may well suspect that it was added by some transcriber, to whom the force of the participle *αποδεξαμενοι* was not fully known. *Δεχομενοι* is simply to receive: *αποδεχομενοι*, to receive gladly. Compare, accordingly, the clause which has been cited with Acts xxi. 17, xv. 4, &c. &c. In a few instances the simple and the compound verb appear to be interchanged.

Rom. viii. 23. “—not only they, but ourselves also, who have the first-fruits of the spirit,” &c. Dr. Taylor’s paraphrase is, “Not only is the bulk of mankind subject to many sorrows, but even we *Apostles*, who are of all men,” &c.; and in his notes he assigns some reasons for understanding the statement as descriptive exclusively of the apostles.

In the first place, he says, that the

VOL. XIX.

3 Y

expressions *αλλα και αυτοι, —και θμεις αυτοι* “are very emphatical.” This is admitted: but when he adds, “and direct our thoughts to some persons of distinction and eminence,” I cannot subscribe to his opinion; since he takes for granted what he ought to prove. Do such expressions always, or generally or necessarily, denote *a few individuals of eminence and distinction?* Paul here speaks of himself and his fellow-apostles in common with the bulk of Christians: and the emphasis of his language *αλλα και αυτοι, κ. τ. λ.* consists in its marking out *even* believers in our Saviour as not exempted from certain natural evils. He who glances at Griesbach’s outer margin, in loc., will perceive that ancient translators and paraphrasts were, like Dr. Taylor, embarrassed by the introductory words of ver. 23.

Further; This most valuable writer observes, that the clause “who have received the first-fruits of the spirit,” is strictly true of the apostles only. However, “the first-fruits of the spirit” are not so much its choicest, richest gifts, as those of which the *earliest* disciples of Christ were the subjects. The term will be sufficiently explained by James i. 18: and in this sense it was perfectly applicable to such members of the church at Rome as had partaken in spiritual gifts; to the converts of the apostles, as well as to the apostles themselves.

In fine, I cannot agree with Dr. Taylor, that “there will be little or no argument in this verse, if it is understood of the whole body of *Christians*.” Were only the apostles exposed to sufferings for their religion? Is it to *them alone* that the assurance in ver. 28 belongs? Surely, not. It follows then that Paul’s reasoning and inferences call upon us for no very restricted explanation of the verse before us.

Mr. Belsham, in loc., speaks of Dr. Taylor as offering “some good reasons to prove, that Paul here alludes to the apostles and the earliest converts to the Christian faith.” Had Dr. Taylor so modified his paraphrase, I would not have animadverted on it. The fact is, that by *ourselves—we ourselves, &c.*, he understands the apostles, and none besides.

It is true, Mr. Belsham himself

inclines to that more extensive interpretation for which I am pleading: in his paraphrase he employs less hesitating language than in his note.

Eph. iv. 26, "Be ye ANGRY, and sin not. iv. 31, Let all ANGER be put away from you."—How are these passages to be reconciled to each other? I conceive, that the apostle when he says, "Be ye *angry* and sin not," has the *act* in his view—when he says, "Let all *anger* be put away from you,"—the *habit*. That anger is not essentially and absolutely unlawful, appears from Mark iii. 5; where we read that our Lord looked round, on his accusers, "with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts."

"Anger," remarks Hallett, (Notes, &c. I. 130,) "in the New Testament, is never spoken of with allowance, but in superiors towards their inferiors." This point he at great length endeavours to illustrate and establish (I. 129, &c., II. 358): and such is the principle on which he aims at explaining both the prohibition and the concession which I have quoted.

The observations of the very able Annotator, are ingenious, without being conclusive. For Luke xv. 28, is a proof that anger can, in fact, be indulged by an inferior towards his elders. The older of the two brothers, in the parable of the prodigal son, "was angry (*αρρισθη*), and would not go in: therefore came his father out and entreated him." We know, besides, that children, youth, and even adults, often feel anger, and sometimes not unreasonably, at those who, nevertheless, are of the same rank and standing with themselves.

Paley's excellent definition of *anger* and his masterly observations upon the *act* and *habit*,* make it unnecessary for me to pursue the subject.

N.

Brief Notes on the Bible.

No. XXIV.

God is Love! 1 John iv. 8, 16.

THIS declaration, one of the most heart-encouraging in the Scriptures, comes in the very teeth of Calvinism, which teaches that "God

* M. Philos. B. iii. Pt. ii. Ch. vi. vii.

is wrath," unappeasable except by an infinite atonement; although nothing can be clearer than that man, being a finite creature, incapable of any thing infinite, cannot commit an infinite offence.

We are required, in devout and cordial sympathy with this text, *to love God*.

Dr. Young has well observed, "Love and love only is the loan for love."

And our Apostle has very appositely said, (ver. 19,) "We love him because he first *loved us*."

No impossibilities are enjoined upon mortals.

But, it is impossible to love an invisible being, without a fixed, unhesitating persuasion that he loveth us.

Who, and what description of persons, are thus required to love God?

All and every to whose knowledge, through the medium of the gospel, the requisition may extend: in other words, and in the course of ages, all mankind.

Then the injunction implies his universal love, co-extensive with the love that he requires.

Not his love for a class, impiously denominated *the elect*.

If there exist a man in the slightest degree *doubtful* of God's love to him, individually, who yet professes to love God, I pronounce him an unimposing, indeed, because an uncredited, hypocrite; his profession being contrary to nature, to that immutable nature implanted in him by his Creator. In that man observe the inseparable union of cant with insincerity.

It has been imputed to Unitarianism—as a beacon, I presume, to hapless mortals tending thitherward—that it is a cold and heartless profession, that its meagre faith supplies no cheering hopes, no consolation upon a death-bed.

What! no consolation in the firm assurance that "God is Love;" that our voucher for it is *unimpeachable*; that his tender mercies prevail over and pervade all his works; and in no instance so eminently, as in the paternal mission of Jesus, to certify a resurrection from the death impending?

No consolation, that we are passing into the hands of "*our Father* who is in heaven;" into his hands, whose

high pleasure it was to create us frail, and whose characteristic *love* must necessarily incline him to treat our frailties leniently; whose nature can be disinclined to none but the stubborn, unreluctant sinner; nor to him but for a season, and with the gracious purpose of reclaiming him?

Can he be void of a death-bed consolation, who has been accustomed to regard and look up to his Creator as *anxious* (if the expression be consistent with his attributes) for the happiness of all his rational offspring, as loving them universally and impartially, and because he has created them; who has a thousand times announced his placability to sinners, exacting no other *atonement* for offences than a sincere repentance, exemplified in purified morals and corresponding habits of life?

Say rather, that the Unitarian, under the influence of his habitual trust in such declarations, might in his extremity sing a song of triumph, when the devoutest professor of Orthodoxy—*ceteris paribus* in respect to the purity of their lives—might be weighed down with oppressive forebodings, the result of his lower estimate of the Divine character!*

The inconsistent charge has also been brought against Unitarians that they respect too lightly the threatenings of divine vengeance, fritter away their literal import, and repose too rashly, and even presumptuously, on the assurances of divine love, abounding as they confessedly are.

But, is *that* an argument against Unitarianism “suppling consolation upon a death-bed”? The assumption is a *non sequitur*, so palpable as to induce a smile. The converse might fairly be argued; leaving the question open as to the correctness of Unitarian apprehensions on the subject.

No, Sir! let us receive our Apostle's repeated axiom—with the humblest and the warmest gratitude receive and cherish it—in its genuine sense, that God's love to mankind is a feeling, which his power enables him to gratify; that, as the declaration of it is absolute, his love must be unlimited; and, whatever presuming mortals (men who would appropriate the Divine mercy) may suggest

to the contrary, let us rest in the conviction that the God who is Love, views, in his boundless survey of the universe, the shrinking Calvinist, the confiding Unitarian, and the whole human race with undisturbed complacence, and with an equal regard to their eternal welfare.

Considering the stress laid in the Scriptures upon the article of *faith*, and the saving merit ascribed to it, of which these examples may suffice,

“*As thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee*”—

“*Thy faith hath made thee whole*”—

“*Thy faith hath saved thee*”—

And, considering that the Unitarian's faith in the Divine benignity, even were it overweening, appears so consonant to the spirit of the gospel, it would be difficult to conceive how it can ever be imputed to him for unrighteousness.

Ill betide—I could almost breathe the imprecation—ill betide the sainted bigot, who would divest him of this faith on the verge of eternity! It may be more charitable to add—Enlighten, O God! the mind so clouded as to question its efficacy in our departing moments!

BREVIS.

P. S. All sects and denominations concur in speaking of the Almighty as the Father of the human race. Contemplating him in this endearing character, let us retire from it to one of ourselves, upon the supposition of his being even morally certain that some or one of any children he might have, would, maugre all his endeavours to make them virtuous, so act as to “perish everlasting.” Should we hesitate, if that man took a wife, or approached a woman, to pronounce him the worst and wickedest of all bad men? Would the man who volunteered himself the instrument of such perdition, deserve from us a more respectful mention? I leave the Calvinists to make the application.

B.

SIR,
LATELY, when I was on a visit in the country, I laid my hands on the Evangelical Magazine, and noticed the passage on which your correspondent R. B. has animadverted with just

* Vide Postscript.

severity, p. 409. When I read the passage I said, This is in course, and gives me no concern. But I am sorry to find that a learned and estimable man, the Bishop of St. David's, should have chosen to pronounce in the House of Lords that Unitarians are not Christians. Whether the Bishop means that they are unbelievers in disguise, or that, though they fancy themselves Christians, they are not really such, I neither know nor wish to be informed. But as I would willingly suppose that the Bishop does not profess to search the secrets of the heart, I shall consider his declaration as meaning, that though Unitarians believe what they profess to believe, still they are not entitled to the appellation of Christians. What then is the definition of the term Christian? I should propose the following; a Christian is one who admits the divine mission of Christ, and consequently acknowledges his religion as the rule of faith and practice. And I should add, that he who successfully endeavours to act up to the moral precepts of this religion, in the expectation of a life to come, is a real and a good Christian. This definition would not satisfy the Bishop of St. David's. Nor, I presume, would the Bishop's definition satisfy the Catholic. But the Bishop, no doubt, would say that the Unitarian rejects the *essential doctrines* of Christianity. But who is authorized to determine what are and what are not its essential doctrines? Until this question is settled, it may seem reasonable to conclude that those doctrines constitute the essence of Christianity which are inculcated in the New Testament with such perspicuity and force, that they have been admitted, in every age, though with various combinations of error, by all who have borne the Christian name. The doctrines for which the Bishop is so zealous are doubtless essential to the system which he considers as Christianity, but I should marvel if his Lordship, with the aid of all who think with him, could prove them to be essential to the great practical object of the Christian faith, that is to living soberly, righteously and godly in this present world, in the expectation of "that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ." Not awed by

the Bishop's skill in Greek, I repeat the words, "and of our Saviour Jesus Christ;" which version is not inconsistent with the terms of the original, as the Greeks not unfrequently pass from one subject to another without repeating the article before the second. Of this some curious examples may be found in Thucydides. I know the canon by which it has been attempted to prove the divinity of Christ from the passage now cited. But in the application of the canon it is assumed, that the expression, "the great God," can be an attributive of the subject, Jesus Christ. But if this can be, how comes it to pass that we never meet with the simple expression *our God Jesus Christ* in the New Testament? an expression which was used when the divinity of our Lord was at length believed. Jesus Christ is sometimes called our Saviour, but his usual designation is that of "our Lord;" a designation which occurs about 100 times in the epistolary part of the New Testament. But in no one instance is he simply called *our God*. But, perhaps, some one may say, is not the passage in question rendered ambiguous by the omission of the article? Ambiguous to whom? I will venture to say that it was ambiguous to no one who read the epistle in the age in which it was penned. But granting it to be ambiguous, which version has a just right to be preferred, that which makes Jesus Christ the same with the great Supreme, or that which distinguishes him from his Father and our Father, his God and our God; that which makes the passage speak a language consistent with the *tenor* of the sacred volume from beginning to end, or that which imports into it an inexplicable mystery which has no support whatever except from two or three passages of dubious construction? Yet for explaining these passages in such a manner as to render them conformable to *innumerable clear and express declarations of scripture*, Unitarians are reproached as unlearned, and pronounced not to be Christians!

I believe the Bishop of St. David's to be a Christian, and though in my judgment a mistaken, yet a conscientious Christian. But allow me to define the *essentials* of the Christian faith, and let me imbibe a little of his

Lordship's spirit, and borrow his Lordship's mode of reasoning, and I shall be able to shew that he has no just claim to this appellation. Christianity, I should say, teaches that God is *one undivided essence or person*; but this *fundamental* doctrine the Bishop does not believe; therefore the Bishop is no Christian.

Quam temere in nosmet legem sancimus iniquam!

E. COGAN.

Sir, Sept. 14, 1824.

AS those of your correspondents who are more accustomed to discussions of this nature, do not appear disposed to examine the papers of "*Philadelphus*," (pp. 15, 283,) I feel compelled to resume the subject.

It has been shewn, to the satisfaction, I should imagine, of *Philadelphus* himself, [p. 389,] that he is mistaken in ascribing to Dr. Priestley the opinion that future suffering will not (or may not) be necessary for the reformation of those who have passed through life in vicious courses. The readers of the *Monthly Repository*, however, although they may entertain a high veneration for Dr. Priestley's talents and excellences, will not be satisfied that an opinion is unfounded merely because it was not held by him. The question must after all be tried on its own merits; and lest any should suppose that it is easier to take away from this opinion the sanction of Dr. Priestley's authority, than to shew its intrinsic erroneousness, I venture once more to solicit your notice.

No one, I would hope, will be so unjust as to impute a want of benevolent feeling to him who, from a serious conviction that those who die in impenitence must undergo grievous suffering in order to their purification, endeavours to impress his own belief on the minds of others. This persuasion respecting the future destiny of the wicked, is not to be confounded with a malignant wish for the misery of our fellow-creatures. If, indeed, it be false, let its fallacy be pointed out, and whatever may be the immediate effects of its rejection among mankind, every rational person would in that case acknowledge its untruth. But if it be a true persuasion, does not benevolence itself require that,

having impressed it deeply on our own minds, we should labour to give it a due influence on the character of our fellow-creatures?

This course was adopted by the Apostle Paul. "Knowing," says he, "the terrors of the Lord, we persuade men." Can any one justly charge him with a want of philanthropy? Was not this conduct the best evidence of a generous concern for the welfare of mankind?

Philadelphus acknowledges, and not without reason, that his "thoughts are thrown out with little regard to logical precision;" he might have added, I apprehend, with little regard to coherence or consistency. Near the beginning of his first letter he declares himself "A believer in the doctrine of Philosophical Necessity and an Optimist," adding, "I will candidly confess that this view of the system of the universe, although, upon the whole, highly calculated to inspire confidence in the great Power that rules over us, has nevertheless, at some seasons, suggested uncomfortable reflections." He goes on to state the nature of these reflections, and then adds, "From such thoughts as these I have gladly fled for consolation to the exhilarating declarations of the sacred writers, that a period shall arrive when pain and death and every description of evil will be abolished, and God shall be all in all." Who would have expected to find this writer intimating in the same paragraph, that the prospect of future sufferings which is exhibited in scripture, even as interpreted on the scheme of Universal Restoration ("sufferings such as even Dr. Southwood Smith supposes may be endured by some human beings") cannot be contemplated with composure; and who would expect to find him endeavouring by a train of reasoning to prove, what he thinks to have been the opinion of Dr. Priestley, that this prospect may not be realized, and concluding with a candid confession, p. 286, "The Scriptures do appear to me to contradict the theory of the Divine Government which I have framed out of the scanty stores of my analogical gleanings;" evidently meaning by this confession, that analogical reasoning on the future condition of man, justifies hopes which the *Scriptures* appear at least to discourage?

It will be difficult I think to make out the consistency of these statements. They indicate a mind vacillating between philosophy and revelation, sensible at times of the insufficiency of the former, and disposed to rest with confidence in the latter; but at other times pursuing analogical reasonings, (or rather, perhaps, indulging benevolent conjectures,) till conclusions are formed at variance with the Scriptures as generally understood; and hence, not indeed inclined to reject Revelation (for it is expressly said, "I hold myself bound to give up any speculation which stands opposed to clear and positive scriptural doctrines"); but anxious to interpret the passages of scripture "which *appear* to teach that men will be punished after the resurrection for the sins committed in the body," so that they may "be consistent with the hypothesis that the pains of this life may suffice for the whole of our future existence."

Philadelphus, as we have seen, thinks that Dr. Priestley, and in consequence of his statements Dr. Hartley, had been led to hope for the reformation, without punishment or suffering, of those who have passed through life in vicious courses; and, endeavouring "to discover the train of reasoning which they pursued," he thinks that he has adduced at least plausible reasons in favour of the conclusion to which they had arrived; and his great solicitude is derived from the circumstance that there are "several passages of scripture which *appear* to teach that men will be punished after the resurrection for the sins committed in the body," and which, of course, *appear* to be inconsistent with his speculations as to the termination of pain with the present life. This is all in itself very perplexing, but it becomes doubly so when contrasted with the language of the writer, p. 284, in commenting on Dr. Hartley's assertion that reason "approves of the pure and indefinite happiness of the good," and "acquiesces in the *indefinite* punishment of the wicked." "As God is no respecter of persons, it would seem to follow," says *Philadelphus*, "not that there should be such an immense disparity in the *future condition* of such mixed characters, but that rewards and punishments will be dealt out with

perfect impartiality in exact proportion to the degree of virtue or of vice which belongs to each individual character." How can this passage be reconciled with the denial in *toto* of future punishment? And further, as if to form a climax of inconsistency, while "reasoning from analogy" for the purpose of shewing that future suffering may not be necessary to change the views and reform the habits of sinners, this benevolent, but too hasty, writer actually admits and reasons upon the existence of that very suffering.

Adverting to the hypothesis which supposes a continuance of consciousness and activity after death, he expressly says of the virtuous, "It is reasonable to suppose that, actuated by the same feelings which distinguish good men in this world, their efforts have been unceasingly directed to *relieving the miserable, enlightening the ignorant, and reclaiming the vicious.*" In noticing the hypothesis which assumes a suspension of consciousness between death and resurrection, he does not, indeed, explicitly advance the same idea; but there is nothing in his argument which tends to establish a distinction between the two hypotheses as to this point. We have here then a distinct admission of *vice and misery* as existing in the future state. *Philadelphus* does not indeed say that the one will be the effect or the punishment of the other; but when he sets out (p. 284) with supposing "the invisible world and the invisible dispensations of Providence to be analogous to what appears; or that both together make up one uniform scheme, the two parts of which,—the part we see, and that which is beyond our observation are analogous to each other;" he warrants the inference that, as in this world vice naturally tends to produce misery, so in the world to come the vicious will be exposed to suffering as the consequence of their evil character and conduct.

From what has appeared under the signature of *Philadelphus*, in "The Monthly Repository," I am induced to anticipate with confidence that his candour will prompt him, on a careful review of his papers, to acknowledge the justice of these remarks. If this be admitted, if it appear, after all, that we cannot reason fairly from

analogy without anticipating the existence of suffering in the future life as the effect of unrepented guilt,—the bestowment of rewards, and the infliction of punishments, with perfect impartiality, in exact proportion to the degree of virtue or of vice which belongs to each individual character,—I do not see that the theory of the Divine Government which we are led by reason to form is opposed to that unfolded in the Scriptures: “Say ye to the righteous, that it shall be well with him; for they shall eat of the fruit of their doings. Woe to the wicked! it shall be ill with him: for the reward of his hands shall be given him.” Isa. iii. 10, 11. God “will judge the world in righteousness.” Acts xvii. 31. God “will render to every man according to his deeds,” &c. Rom. ii. 6, et seq. The dictates of sound philosophy and the plain declarations of Holy Writ concur to assure us that “it is an evil and a bitter thing to sin against God.” Even on the most favourable supposition, admitting that the sufferings of the wicked will have a purifying tendency and effect, (and, I frankly confess, that I know not how, on any other theory, we can both

“assert Eternal Providence,
And *justify* the ways of God to man,”)

the prospect disclosed to us should excite alarm in the sinner, and rouse the righteous to zealous exertion.

When the awful language of the New Testament denouncing bodily endurance on the impenitent is softened down as much as possible, granting that it is but a figurative mode of representing the realities of the spiritual world to our imperfect apprehension, there are still the tortures of the mind, the raging fire of evil passion, the overwhelming force of sinful habits, the goadings of an accusing conscience, the horrors of remorse, and the pangs of repentance to be endured. He who has felt in any degree the wretchedness which sin produces in this world, he who has witnessed with a feeling heart the misery which it brings on the sinner, will not be inclined (unless he denies a future state altogether) to entertain doubt as to its baneful operation in the world to come.

There will, no doubt, be great dif-

ference, according to previous circumstances, in the future condition of those who leave this world unprepared for the pure happiness of heaven. “He who knew not his Master’s will,” and therefore did it not, “will be beaten with few stripes,” will need a comparatively gentle course of discipline. The communication of that knowledge which in this life was withheld, would be likely to exercise on his mind an immediate, powerful, and happy influence. But alas for him, “who knew his Master’s will, and yet did things worthy of stripes,” him to whom the majesty and the loveliness of the Divine character as exhibited in the works of God and in the gospel of Christ have been displayed, and who, notwithstanding, lived and died without cultivating the fear and love of God. Can we be surprised that such men should incur a dreadful condemnation, be beaten with many stripes, and having resisted in vain the grand motives presented to their minds, be subjected to “tribulation and anguish,” to a discipline of tremendous severity, and be placed in a situation of eternal disadvantage? These are, indeed, prospects painful to the pious and benevolent mind; but it is of little use to close our eyes to them. We cannot by this means even avoid the uncomfortable reflections to which the existence of evil gives rise. Suppose it could be *proved* that there will be no future suffering, suppose that the language of the New Testament were shewn to be consistent with this hypothesis, the object aimed at would not be attained. He who thinks that future suffering, although corrective, is inconsistent with the superintendance “of a truly benevolent Being,” and hence persuades himself that it will not be inflicted, will still be dissatisfied. When he notices “the miseries which” in an infinite variety “flesh is heir to,” (and the existence of which can neither be denied nor doubted,) he will be sometimes tempted to doubt whether such things could happen under the government of a truly benevolent Being, and will continue to experience uncomfortable reflections. For these doubts and painful emotions, whether suggested by the existence of evil at present or by the anticipation of future evil, there is

but one remedy. "I grant," says your correspondent, "that these doubts subside when on taking a more enlarged and dispassionate survey of the world, we are enabled to discern the tendency of all events to produce a progressive amelioration of the state of society."

Reason and scripture agree in assuring us that under the government of a just and holy God, vice must produce misery; a full conviction of this grand principle is essential to our improvement and usefulness, and even the painful feelings which at times arise out of this state of things, are adapted to be useful in establishing within us a horror of vice, and prompting us to efforts for its banishment from the world.

Reason and scripture (reasonably understood) encourage us also to believe that under the government of a wise and good Being, all the evil which exists will be ultimately overruled and rendered conducive to universal good. A full conviction of this grand principle is essential, and is sufficient to our peace and joy.

A practical persuasion that the Divine Being is carrying on a vast scheme which will issue in the welfare of all his creatures, and that this scheme is to be accomplished by the diffusion of holiness and the destruction of sin, will make us at present "Secure to be as blest as we can bear," and will prepare us for a felicity which "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard," and which it hath not entered into the mind of man to conceive.

G. B. W.

SIR,
In the explanations given of the various passages in the New Testament, where worship is said to have been addressed to Jesus Christ, or any other than the One God the Father, it has been usual to shew not only that the expressions in the original were applicable to those acts of respect and reverence which the custom of eastern countries rendered to persons of superior rank or acquirements, but also that there is no reason to conclude from our translators having adopted the word "worship," that they understood the terms in a more limited sense as referring to that

high species of adoration which is due to the Deity alone. Various instances have accordingly been brought forward establishing the latitude of signification borne by the word "worship," about the period when those translators lived. I have, however, lately met with what appears to me an excellent illustration of the ancient use of the English word, and which, as I do not recollect ever to have seen it noticed as illustrative of the passages in question, may, perhaps, be considered not unworthy a place in your Miscellany. It occurs in Lord Coke's Commentary on Littleton, a work nearly contemporary with our authorized translation of the Scriptures, and in the hands of every lawyer.

In the text of Littleton, Sect. lxxxv, the mode of performing the feudal service of *homage* is thus described in Norman French:—"Car quant le tenant ferra homage a son seignior, il serra discinet, et son test discover, et son seignior seera, et le tenant genulera devant luy sur ambideux genues, et tiendra ses maines extendes et joyntes ensemble enter les maines le seignior, et issint dirra: Jeo de veigne vostre home de cest jour en avant de vie et de member, et de *terrene honor*," &c.; which Lord Coke translates, "For when the tenant shall make homage to his lord, he shall be ungirt, and his head uncovered, and his lord shall sit, and the tenant shal kneele before him on both his knees, and hold his hands joyntly together betweene the hands of his lord, and shall say thus: I become your man from this day forward of life and limbe, and of *earthly worship*," &c.: and his comment is simply this "*De terrene honor*." "Expressed by kneeling at the feet of his lord." An example more in point can hardly be desired.

E.

SIR,
Aug. 18, 1824.
In reading the pages of the Monthly Repository, I have often been compelled to think that great misconception, erroneous statement, and of course inconsequential arguing are found in the productions of some of your correspondents, when they assail the system of religion usually called Evangelical, Orthodox, or Calvinistic.

Often have I wished that some equitable censor would interpose on such occasions, to repress wrong representations, not only in your work, but in all other religious publications. Surely it would be no great degree of moral heroism, for men to lay upon their consciences the obligation of taking the requisite pains to understand, before they rebuke; and to describe fairly the doctrines held by others, however much they may disapprove them. I should dread, indeed, to set my foot on this thorny ground; not knowing how far I might be drawn into the thicket of replies and rejoinders, and having neither the love of controversy nor the leisure for it. But I cannot pass by two passages in the last Number of the Repository, which appear to me to call loudly, the one for severe reprobation, and the other for respectful remonstrance. I am not presuming to determine who is right and who is wrong, upon the points of doctrine referred to. Every man should examine for himself these great questions, with a *serious* mind, and availing himself of all the light that he can procure. I only plead for fair treatment.

I think, Sir, you could not feel pleasure in admitting to a place in your pages the "Satiric Fragment" on the doctrine of the Trinity (p. 421). I trust that many who reject that doctrine, feel the duty of discussing it with seriousness. The inquiry, What has God revealed concerning his own nature and manner of existence? is, in every point of view, a solemn and awful subject; and which never, I humbly think, should be entered upon without a serious and devotional state of mind. The broad jesting and buffoonery of that Fragment are unworthy of any rational and candid enemy of the doctrine thus ridiculed. The author ought to have reflected that many have been and are conscientious believers of that doctrine, who have not taken it upon trust, who do not build their faith on prepossessions, who have carefully exercised their best reasoning powers upon the question, and who would not believe without what appeared to them rational and sufficient proof. The wit and ingenuity of the writer have, I fear, inebriated his judgment. He could scarcely, otherwise, suppose that his

representations stood upon an honest basis. Whoever opposes the Trinitarian doctrine should do it the justice to recollect, that those who maintain it carefully guard us against imagining that they hold the Divine Essence to be One and Three, in the same sense, or under the same relations. Whether their interpretations of scripture, on which alone they rest their belief, be correct or not, it ought not to be forgotten that, in their own conceptions, they fully believe and strenuously assert the Unity of God.

My other objection is to the strain of representation in page 417, which identifies Calvinism with the gross and revolting notions of Antinomianism. It is peculiarly painful to see this unjust and confused manner of representation come from so respectable a person as Mr. Worsley. He exults in his *truly* illustrious ancestry: but has he forgotten that George and Obadiah Hughes were Calvinists? He justly celebrates "the purity of their principles," and he can scarcely fail to know that they, with the great body of the Puritans and Nonconformists, held the doctrine of Divine Influence in the conversion and sanctification of souls; while they perceived not the least inconsistency in exhortations and invitations, arguments and persuasions, addressed to the unconverted, urging them to make a sincere application to the Saviour, and "to pray for pardon," and for all other spiritual blessings.

Be Mr. Worsley's own religious opinions what they may, I cannot but be astonished that he should be so little acquainted with the faith of his revered ancestors and of all consistent Calvinists, as to say concerning such a style of exhortation, that it "is a needless and must be an absurd thing, if none can pray as they ought, but they who are already renewed by the Holy Ghost, and that number is exceedingly small. As well might men pray to a picture or a statue; as well talk to the wind." Upon the ground of this assumption, he applauds as "consistency" and "integrity," that which to my perceptions appears to be no other than *horrid impiety*. Is it possible that Mr. Worsley's theological reading should be so scanty, or that his investigations of religious doctrines have been so crude and

hasty, as that he should not be aware of the distinction which all consistent Calvinists make between *natural* and *moral* ability or inability? Is it possible that he never studied, or that he has forgotten, a distinction of such prime importance in theological disquisition? It might reasonably be supposed that Mr. Edwards's *Enquiry into the Freedom of the Will*, (said by Dr. Priestley to have "obviated every shadow of objection," and to be "unanswerable;" and so often referred to in Mr. Belsham's *Elements of the Philosophy of the Mind*,) is a work not unknown to a man of liberal education and a Necessarian. Every consistent Calvinist maintains that the *inability* [but Mr. Edwards clearly shews that the term is improper: we ought to say *INDISPOSITION*] of an unconverted sinner to comply with the calls of the gospel, and to perform religious duties in a spiritual and acceptable manner, is not a *natural* inability, but is altogether *moral*; that is, it consists not in any absence of mental faculties and physical powers, but solely in the *WANT OF INCLINATION*. It would seem superfluous to cite so well-known a book as this of Mr. Edwards's; but I may request the serious reader to study Part I. Sect. iv. for the brief, but satisfactory elucidation of this most important and vital distinction. I would also intreat attention to a few sentences from an admirable paper, first published in a periodical work in 1785, by a gentleman whose eminence in theological knowledge, equalled only by his exalted character for piety and benevolence, has long invested him with the love and veneration of those who have the happiness to know him.

"The distinction between *natural* and *moral* *INABILITY* illustrated.

"Natural inability arises from some object without the will.

"Natural inability is neither praiseworthy nor blame-worthy.

"Natural inability is a sufficient excuse, for not doing any thing required.

"Moral inability consists in the opposition or disinclination of the will itself.

"Moral inability is sometimes blameable, and sometimes commendable.

"Moral inability is no excuse at all, for any neglect of duty.

"Paul was no more under a *natural*

inability to do a great deal against the truth, than Joseph's brethren were under a *natural inability* to speak peaceably to him. He had a natural ability to invent lies, or to oppose the truth; and they had a natural ability to speak the language of peace and brotherly-kindness. But grace was the cause of Paul's *moral inability* to do any thing against the truth; and envy and spite were the cause of their *moral inability* to speak friendly to Joseph.

"When we say of a man destitute of an honest principle, that he *cannot* refrain from cheating, when he has an opportunity of doing it secretly, is not this inability far from affording him any excuse? If some men are so addicted to uncleanness, that they *cannot* look on a beautiful female, without lusting after her in their hearts; if some are so addicted to profaneness, that they that know them are ready to say, they *cannot* open their mouths without an oath; if some are so given to lying, that they *cannot* speak the truth; some so revengeful, that they *cannot* forgive an injury; and many so easily provoked, that they *cannot* keep their temper if you contradict them; surely such a kind of inability will not be admitted as an excuse, either by God or man. Nor will it avail a sinner, to plead before his future Judge, that his mind was too carnal to bear subjection to the divine law, or his heart so proud that he *could not* stoop to salvation by grace." Dr. RYLAND's *Remarks on the Different Representations of Evangelical Doctrine*, Part II. pp. 19, 23, 24.

I cannot but hope that, upon reconsideration, Mr. Worsley will perceive the justice of revoking his declarations on the tendency and practical application of true Calvinism, as if it superseded the use of commands, exhortations, arguments, or any methods of rational persuasion, to induce "the wicked to forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts." All that is wanted is a sincere inclination: but WHENCE must a revolution of will, disposition, or inclination come? "The thing wanting is, not a being *able*, but a being *willing*. There are faculties of mind, and a capacity of nature, and *every thing else sufficient*, but a *DISPOSITION*.

Nothing is wanting but a **WILL.**" (*Edwards, as ref.*) Nature and experience, reason and revelation, combine to say, "It is GOD that worketh in you, both to will and to do, of his good pleasure."

A CALVINIST.

SIR,
IS it permitted to an anxious and (I trust) sincere inquirer after religious truth, to submit to the advocates of Unitarianism a few difficulties which embarrass him in their explication of the Christian doctrine of Atonement; a solution of which he should be much gratified to obtain through the medium of your highly respectable publication?

Unitarians (I believe) reject the Orthodox doctrine of the Atonement, because they conceive that it is totally inconsistent with the justice and equity of the Supreme Being to "punish sin in a surety; and appoint such a way of salvation as requires an innocent person to suffer in order that the guilty may go unpunished." And it must be allowed that such conduct is directly opposed to all our ideas of justice. Yet they allow that Christ did actually suffer for our *benefit* :— that by his death, "not as the suffering of a substitute but as the seal and ratification of a better covenant," (vide Improved Ver. Matt. xx. 28,) we are ransomed or delivered from the power of sin, and consequently from final perdition. Now,

1. Is it not as inconsistent with the justice and equity of God to permit that an innocent person should suffer for the *benefit* of a criminal, as that he should suffer in his *stead*? Or, if the injustice in the former case be not as *great* (in degree) as in the latter, is it not *equally* an injustice?

2. Does not the moral government of the world present similar instances of seeming injustice,—nay, even of *vicarious sufferings*? "Men by their follies" (says Bishop Butler) "run themselves into extreme distress, which would be fatal to them were it not for the assistance of others. God commands by the law of nature that we should afford them this assistance in many cases where we cannot do it without very great pains, and labour and sufferings to ourselves: and we

see in what a variety of ways the personal sufferings of one contribute to the relief of another . . . so that vicarious punishment is a providential employment of everyday's experience." (*Analogy of Nat. and Rev. Religion, Pt. II. 2.*) Are not children often punished (and that before they have done either good or evil) for the sins of their parents?

3. Is not the whole animal creation, though innocent of moral guilt, made subject to pain and death?

If, then, Unitarians admit that the world is under the moral government of a holy and just Being, notwithstanding those seeming anomalies in its administration, why should they reject the Orthodox doctrine of Atonement (certainly the most agreeable to the language of Scripture) on account of similar anomalies, which we find it impossible to reconcile with our notions of the justice and equity of the Almighty?

As these objections, which I have endeavoured to state as briefly as possible, have been often urged, it is not impossible but that they have been satisfactorily answered by some of the able defenders of Unitarian sentiments; in which case it would answer every object which the writer of this has in view, if some of your contributors would point out in what publications they are to be met with, and where they are to be procured.

Note. Would it not be advantageous to the cause of truth (on which ever side it may rest,) if the principal works in defence of Unitarianism were presented to the National Library at the British Museum? At present only a few of them are to be found in its catalogue, while all that has been written against it are mustered on its shelves.

Ecclesiastic.

SIR,

Penzance.

THE occasional, and in some circumstances, even the habitual attendance of Unitarians on the religious services of the Establishment would be a matter of more doubtful propriety than it now is, if that Establishment were more consistently Trinitarian. But, for a just view of the Liturgy of the Church of England in

A little prior to this date, this order of the Classis began to be issued for different places, and is now become frequent.

" 6. Mr. Meeke is desired to speake to Mr. Jones, senior, that he would not (in administringe the Supper) walke contrary to the rules held by this association, accordinge to an Ordinance of Parliament.

" 9. A summons sent out, to the end Edward Tetlow, of Houghton, and William Birch, of Redish, should appear before this Classe the seconde Tuesday in May next.

" The 67th Meeteinge at Manchester, May 11^o, 1652.

" 4. Mr. Harrison, in the name of the Delegates appointed for the Provinciall Assemblie, gave an account what they did there: viz. that they met in Preston church, and Mr. Gee preached; but in regard of the absence of six Ruleing Elders, the Assemblie was adjourned till the first Tuesday, which is the fifth day of October next; and the Provinciall still to bee kept at Preston.

" 12. It is ordered that the Classis sermon bee deferred to the next day, and that is to bee kept as a fast, not onely for the Ordination, but also in behalf of Liverpool, which is visited with the plague of pestilence. Mr. Heyricke and Mr. Rathband, or Mr. Meeke, to preach, and those to pray which are formerly appointed at the ordination.

" The 69th Meeteinge at Manchester, July 13^o, Anno Dni, 1652.

" 4. An account to bee given what hath been done in reference to those Ruleinge Elders that have withdrawn from acting as formerly.

" 5. A summons to be sent out to require Raphe Grundie, of Houghton, et uxor ejus, and John Taylor, of Denton, to appeare before the Classis at Manchester, upon Tuesday the tenth day of August next.

" The 70th Meeteinge at Manchester, August y^e 10th, 1652.

" 3. Thomas Walker, one of the Elders of Ashton, underlyne, hath withdrawne from acteinge with y^e Eldershippe as formerly.

" 4. Mr. Angier is desired to give

a further account of this busines the next Classe.

" The 71st Meeteinge at Manchester, 14^{mo} September, 1652.

" 5. Ordered, That before any Minister in the Classe go away from his place, the Classe shall send twoe Ministers to the people there to see if competent provision can bee by them made for him.

" 6. Mr. Heyricke Moderator y^e next Classe, and to continue soe three Classicall days togeather, which same course is to be houlden by all the Ministers in the Classe."

The 72d Meeting was adjourned—no cause is assigned.

" The 73d Meeteinge at Manchester, the 9th November, 1652.

" 5. A summons put forth to require Elizabeth Bardsley and Jane Heape, both of Ashton under-lyne to appeare before the Classis at Manchester the second Tuesday in December next.

" A COPPIE OF A SUMMONS.

" Forasmuch as complaint hath beeene made to this Classe that you whose name (or names) are hereunder written, have committed the sin of —, and not given satisfaction for the same, These are therefore to require you to appeare before this Classe y^e 2d Tuesday in — next, to give an account in the premisses.

" The 74th Meeteinge at Manchester, December 14th, 1652.

" 4th. Richard Pendleton, of Bradford," (in consequence of a summons from the last Classis) " appeared before this Classe, and there did declare himselfe to be very sorrowfull for what hee (at any time) had spoken against Ann, the widowe of John Booth, of Blakeley.

" 5. It is ordered that the Eldershippe of Ashton underlyne shall give an account concerninge the state of Elizabeth Bardsley's business the next Classe.

" 12. Hughe Taylor and Edmund Heywood summoned Elizabeth Bardsley to appeare before the Classis, and shee refused to come in.

" The 75th Meeteinge at Manchester, 11th January, 1652.

" 6. Mr. Harrison brought in the

case of Elizabeth Bardsley, George Morland, alias Eyres, and Ann Chadwicke, all of Ashton underlyne, in order to excommunication.

" Ordered, that summons be sent them to appear the next Classis.

" 11. Mr. Rathband, according to the desire of the Classis, appeared this day, declareing his willingnes to act with y^e Classe.

" *The 76th Meeteinge at Manchester, February 8, 1652.*

" 5. George Morland, alias Eyres, appeared before the Classe, and did confess his committing the foule and scandalouse sins of adultery and fornication with Ann Chadwicke, to whom since he is married, pretending thereby to excuse her appearance.

" 6. Ordered by this Classis that the Eldershippe of Ashton underlyne shall proceed to the excommunication of George Morland, alias Eyres, and Ann his wife.

" 7. Ordered that an exercise shall be holden at Ashton underlyne upon Wednesday y^e 23d Feb. instant, in order to the busines of the excommunication of the parties before mentioned.

" *The 78th Meeteinge at Manchester, March 8^o, 1652.*

" A *bene decessit* granted by this Classe to Mr. Tayler.

" 11. Agreed that upon the request of the Minister and severall of y^e inhabitants of the parish of Ouldham, a monthly exercise shall bee kept at Ouldham every last Wednesday in the moneth.

" *The 79th Meeteinge at Manchester, June 14th, 1653.*

N.B. Thee *Meeteinge* for May was adjourned.

" 5. The Classis is unsatisfied concerneinge Mr. Luke, his sitinge amongst them, untill hee shall give satisfaction concerneinge the things dependinge betweene the Classis and him, which satisfaction the Classis is readie to receive soe sone as hee shall please to give it.

" 9. **NEXT PROVINCIALL** Assembly to bee at Wigan, the seacond Tuesday of November next.

" *The 80th Meeteinge at Manchester, 12^o July, 1653.*

" 3. Ringley—Mr. Holland (though

ordered by the last Classis to preach at this Classis) failed without giveinge any account.

" 11. An admonition to bee sent by Mr. Walker to Mr. Holland concerneinge his present default, and that hee bee at y^e next Classis to give account of it.

" *The 82d Meeteinge at Manchester, September 13^o, 1653.*

" 5. That every particular Eldershippe within the Classis come provided ag^t the next Classis to give account of theire Meeteings and other things to bee enquired of, and especially of these three things; first, whether they keep up theire constant Meeteings; secondly, whether they Register theire most materiall Actes; thirdly, whether they have given, or do give in their delegations to the Classis under their minister's hand, and that the Classis proceed in this worke, till all the Eldershipps be gone over.

" *The 83d Meeteinge at Manchester, October 11^o, 1653.*

" 6. Ordered, that y^e business concerneinge the severall Eldershipps belonginge to this Classe bee proceeded in the next Classe.

" *The 84th Meeteinge at Manchester, December 13^o, 1653.*

5. Next Provinciall Assemblie to bee at Boulton, the first Tuesday of May next.

" 6. Mr. Scoles"—a candidate for ordination—" hath beene examined in Divinitie, but neither in that nor in humane learning, gave any competent satisfaction; was advised for the present to forbeare preaching, and to apply himself diligently to his private studies.

" 7. A day of thanksgivinge to be at Manchester the 4th day of December instant, for the great mercy of God in removinge that general sickness, wherewith the town was afflicted.

" *The 86th Meeteinge at Manchester, February 14^o, 1653.*

" 5. George Morland, of Ashton underlyne, appeared, manifesting great sorrow for his sins of adultery and fornication; the Eldershippe certifieing with him and his wife of their publick and satisfactory acknowledgment, it is ordered by the Classis that the sen-

this respect, we may say it presents a Unitarian ground with Trinitarian patches.

Purpureus, late qui splendeat, unus et
alter
Assuitur paenus.

Unitarianism is the rule, Trinitarianism the exception. This consideration does not appear to have been sufficiently attended to by my neighbour Mr. Le Grice, who, in the papers which he has communicated to you, charges with inconsistency, and even insincerity, Unitarians who attend what he calls Trinitarian worship. For my part, I call that Trinitarian worship which is addressed to the Trinity, or to the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost: that which is addressed to the Father only, in the name of Christ, I call *Unitarian* worship; and I appeal to all who are familiar with the Church ritual, to say which of these two modes of worship is the more prevalent there. They must needs answer in favour of the latter, as, indeed, a mere glance at the Prayer-book is sufficient to evince. To whom does the Church lead us in the confession of our sins? From whom does she declare that the penitent receive absolution? Is it not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ? And is not the far greater part of all the prayers and thanksgivings addressed to the same Almighty Being, mentioning the name of Christ only as that of the Mediator, through whom we approach his throne? If we pass from the prayers to the praises, and consider the devotional hymns which the Church in general uses, these too will be found to be almost exclusively Unitarian, being plain and scriptural versions of the Psalms, savouring nothing of the dogmas of the creeds and articles. But we may boldly say, that even the creeds themselves are not consistently Trinitarian. The principal creed, the most ancient, and that which alone is required to be believed by lay communicants, is *positively Unitarian*, and such as no consistent Trinitarian can subscribe. The Apostles' Creed, (as it is called,) runs thus: *I believe in God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth.* How can such a declaration consist with the opinions of those who might as

well say that they believe in God the Son, maker of heaven and earth? The plain sense of the Creed identifies God with the Almighty Father, and with him exclusively. The Creed proceeds: *And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, &c.* Here we see such an account of our faith in Christ as no honest Trinitarian would ever give: it begins and ends with his humanity: of the stupendous doctrines of his deity and pre-existence it says nothing: this, in the mouth of a Trinitarian, would afford a striking instance of that sort of prevarication which, though it tells the truth, does not tell the whole truth. But let us pass to those symbols which were made in later ages, when the glory of the Christian church was already waxing dim, when her miserable divines were groping in the darkness which their own sophistry had produced, and when the arrogance of childish folly conceived the vain attempt of binding the faith of all future generations, by the decisions of a noisy and intriguing council. The faith which was carried by vote in this manner stands recorded in what we call the Nicene Creed; but, according to more modern notions, even this Creed is not orthodox, for as it declares the Son to be only a derived and secondary God, it does not represent him to be equal to the Father, but manifestly inferior to him. And what shall I say more? To the eternal confusion of all those who presumptuously endeavour to forge shackles for the understandings and consciences of others, it is undeniably true that not even the Athanasian Creed itself is consistently Trinitarian; nay, there is a clause in it which is irretrievably Unitarian. It warns us that we must believe in the Trinity, *neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance.* The word here translated *substance*, is in the original Greek *σύστασις*, that is, *being* or *essence*. According to this Creed, therefore, the three persons form but one *being*, whence it most plainly follows that the word *person*, (*ὑπόστασις*), as here used, signifies not what it does in common acceptation, a distinct, intelligent agent, but merely a character or mode of existence; so that the

three persons, according to this Creed, are no more than three modes or characters, according to which God is revealed to us. Now, this is equivalent to Unitarianism: the Church, therefore, binds us under the direst anathemas to be Unitarians. I fear that I may be thought to trifle with serious things; but let me assure your readers that I am quite in earnest, and do declare that it appears to me that a Trinitarian, if he be consistent, cannot approve of the Church services with any better conscience than a Unitarian can. How should it be otherwise, if the framers of her Liturgy were cramped and embarrassed with a Unitarian Bible, and other remains of Unitarian antiquity?

But, perhaps, it will be said, that if these representations of the public services are just, there remains no sufficient reason for Unitarians to disapprove of them, or to frequent a separate worship. This, however, is not my opinion. The Ritual of the Establishment appears to me to be inconsistent with itself, and not calculated to give satisfaction to either party; and although the tenor of the worship acknowledges the *one God the Father*, yet there is too much of a contrary description to produce that rational and harmonious service which the worship of God ought pre-eminently to be. Important errors, as we conceive, are inculcated in the most solemn and authoritative manner, tending not only to mislead the judgment and overawe the conscience of the weak, but to trouble and distract the mind even of the most established. In this there is a sufficient, yea, an imperative reason for the Unitarian to desire a simpler and purer worship; neither, if he be serious, will he be able to rest contented till he enjoy this privilege, as far as circumstances permit. My design, in the remarks which I have made, has not been to depreciate the importance of proper Unitarian worship, but merely to plead for indulgence towards those whose circumstances forbidding them that advantage, induce them to attend the public devotions of the Establishment rather than none, or who, even while they do more stately frequent the Unitarian chapel, nevertheless see no impro-

priety in being also found more or less frequently among the attendants at the Church. “*Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not, and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him.*”

A FRIEND TO INQUIRY.

Account of the Establishment of Presbyterianism in Manchester.

No. VII.

Manchester,
August 7, 1824.

SIR,

I NOW send you additional extracts from the Register of the Presbyterian Classis, in the district of Manchester, kept in the time of the Commonwealth. After the extracts which have been already made, in pretty full detail, I do not conceive it necessary any longer to insert matters merely in the course of business and order, such as ordaining ministers, certificates of removal, delegations to the Provinciall Meeting, &c., though some particulars introduced in connexion with some of these things might appear interesting to the antiquarian; but I shall confine myself to those particulars which relate to the genius and operation of the Presbyterian system, which throw light upon the opinions and spirit of those times, or to which local or personal considerations may impart a more lasting interest.

WM. JOHNS.

The Register of several Meetings of the Classis subsequent to the 59th,* are unaccountably uninteresting, considering the measures before in agitation, particularly the several compulsory mandates issued for complying with the orders of the Classis, relative to the admission of the Presbyterian system. For which reason, the Meetings from No. 60—65 are entirely passed over.

“*The 66th Meetinge at Manchester,
Aprill 13^o, 1652.*

“ 5. An exercise to bee at Ringley, Wednesday ye 28^o of Aprill instant, Mr. Walton and Mr. Francis to preach.”

* See Vol. XVIII. p. 690.

A little prior to this date, this order of the Classis began to be issued for different places, and is now become frequent.

" 6. Mr. Meeke is desired to speake to Mr. Jones, senior, that he would not (in administringe the Supper) walke contrary to the rules held by this association, accordinge to an Ordinance of Parliament.

" 9. A summons sent out, to the end Edward Tetlow, of Houghton, and William Birch, of Redish, should appear before this Classe the seconde Tuesday in May next.

" *The 67th Meeteinge at Manchester, May 11^o, 1652.*

" 4. Mr. Harrison, in the name of the Delegates appointed for the Provinciall Assemblie, gave an account what they did there: viz. that they met in Preston church, and Mr. Gee preached; but in regard of the absence of six Ruleing Elders, the Assemblie was adjourned till the first Tuesday, which is the fifth day of October next; and the Provinciall still to bee kept at Preston.

" 12. It is ordered that the Classis sermon bee deferred to the next day, and that is to bee kept as a fast, not onely for the Ordination, but also in behalf of Liverpool, which is visited with the plague of pestilence. Mr. Heyricke and Mr. Rathband, or Mr. Meeke, to preach, and those to pray which are formerly appointed at the ordination.

" *The 69th Meeteinge at Manchester, July 13^o, Anno Dni, 1652.*

" 4. An account to bee given what hath been done in reference to those Ruleinge Elders that have withdrawn from acting as formerly.

" 5. A summons to be sent out to require Raphe Grundie, of Houghton, et uxor ejus, and John Taylor, of Denton, to appeare before the Classis at Manchester, upon Tuesday the tenth day of August next.

" *The 70th Meeteinge at Manchester, August y^e 10th, 1652.*

" 3. Thomas Walker, one of the Elders of Ashton, underlyne, hath withdrawne from acteinge with y^e Eldershippe as formerly.

" 4. Mr. Angier is desired to give

a further account of this busines the next Classe.

" *The 71st Meeteinge at Manchester, 14^{mo} September, 1652.*

" 5. Ordered, That before any Minister in the Classe go away from his place, the Classe shall send twoe Ministers to the people there to see if competent provision can bee by them made for him.

" 6. Mr. Heyricke Moderator y^e next Classe, and to continue soe three Classicall days togeather, which same course is to be houlden by all the Ministers in the Classe."

The 72d Meeting was adjourned—no cause is assigned.

" *The 73d Meeteinge at Manchester, the 9th November, 1652.*

" 5. A summons put forth to require Elizabeth Bardsley and Jane Heape, both of Ashton under-lyne to appeare before the Classis at Manchester the second Tuesday in December next.

" A COPPIE OF A SUMMONS.

" Forasmuch as complaint hath beeene made to this Classe that you whose name (or names) are hereunder written, have committed the sin of —, and not given satisfaction for the same, These are therefore to require you to appeare before this Classe y^e 2d Tuesday in — next, to give an account in the premisses.

" *The 74th Meeteinge at Manchester, December 14th, 1652.*

" 4th. Richard Pendleton, of Bradford," (in consequence of a summons from the last Classis) " appeared before this Classe, and there did declare himselfe to be very sorrowfull for what hee (at any time) had spoken against Ann, the widowe of John Booth, of Blakeley.

" 5. It is ordered that the Eldershippe of Ashton underlyne shall give an account concerninge the state of Elizabeth Bardsley's business the next Classe.

" 12. Hughe Taylor and Edmund Heywood summoned Elizabeth Bardsley to appeare before the Classis, and shee refused to come in.

" *The 75th Meeteinge at Manchester, 11th January, 1652.*

" 6. Mr. Harrison brought in the

case of Elizabeth Bardsley, George Morland, alias Eyres, and Ann Chadwicke, all of Ashton underlyne, in order to excommunication.

" Ordered, that summons be sent them to appear the next Classis.

" 11. Mr. Rathband, according to the desire of the Classis, appeared this day, declareing his willingnes to act with ye Classe.

" *The 76th Meeteinge at Manchester, February 8, 1652.*

" 5. George Morland, alias Eyres, appeared before the Classe, and did confess his committing the foule and scandalouse sins of adultery and fornication with Ann Chadwicke, to whom since he is married, pretending thereby to excuse her appearance.

" 6. Ordered by this Classis that the Eldershippe of Ashton underlyne shall proceed to the excommunication of George Morland, alias Eyres, and Ann his wife.

" 7. Ordered that an exercise shall be holden at Ashton underlyne upon Wednesday ye 23d Feb. instant, in order to the busines of the excommunication of the parties before mentioned.

" *The 78th Meeteinge at Manchester, March 8^o, 1652.*

" A *bene decessit* granted by this Classe to Mr. Tayler.

" 11. Agreed that upon the request of the Minister and severall of ye inhabitants of the parish of Ouldham, a monthly exercise shall bee kept at Ouldham every last Wednesday in the moneth.

" *The 79th Meeteinge at Manchester, June 14th, 1653.*

N.B. Thee Meeteinge for May was adjourned.

" 5. The Classis is unsatisfied concerneinge Mr. Luke, his sitinge amongst them, untill hee shall give satisfaction concerneinge the things dependinge betweene the Classis and him, which satisfaction the Classis is readie to receive soe sone as hee shall please to give it.

" 9. **NEXT PROVINCIALL Assembly** to bee at Wigan, the seacond Tuesday of November next.

" *The 80th Meeteinge at Manchester, 12^o July, 1653.*

" 3. Ringley—Mr. Holland (though

ordered by the last Classis to preach at this Classis) failed without giveinge any account.

" 11. An admonition to bee sent by Mr. Walker to Mr. Holland concerneinge his present default, and that hee bee at ye next Classis to give account of it.

" *The 82d Meeteinge at Manchester, September 13^o, 1653.*

" 5. That every particular Eldershippe within the Classis come provided ag' the next Classis to give account of theire Meeteings and other things to bee enquired of, and especially of these three things; first, whether they keep up theire constant Meeteings; secondly, whether they Register theire most materiall Actes; thirdly, whether they have given, or do give in their delegations to the Classis under their minister's hand, and that the Classis proceed in this worke, till all the Eldershipps be gone over.

" *The 83d Meeteinge at Manchester, October 11^o, 1653.*

" 6. Ordered, that ye business concerneinge the severall Eldershipps belonginge to this Classe bee proceeded in the next Classe.

" *The 84th Meeteinge at Manchester, December 13^o, 1653.*

5. Next Provinciall Assemblie to bee at Boulton, the first Tuesday of May next.

" 6. Mr. Scoles"—a candidate for ordination—" hath beene examined in Divinitie, but neither in that nor in humane learning, gave any competent satisfaction; was advised for the present to forbear preaching, and to apply himself diligently to his private studies.

" 7. A day of thanksgiving to be at Manchester the 4th day of December instant, for the great mercy of God in removing that general sickness, wherewith the town was afflicted.

" *The 86th Meeteinge at Manchester, February 14^o, 1653.*

" 5. George Morland, of Ashton underlyne, appeared, manifesting great sorrow for his sins of adultery and fornication; the Eldershippe certifieing with him and his wife of their publick and satisfactory acknowledgment, it is ordered by the Classis that the sen-

tence of excommunication against them bee reversed, and publication thereof made by the said Eldershippe.

*"The 87th Meetinge at Manchester,
March 14^o, 1653.*

" 5. Upon report to the Classis that Mr. Scoales continued to officiate in the Ministry and to Baptize, it is ordered that a letter be sent to Mr. Luke Firth and John Marsden, that he was not ordained by this Classis, but was desired (being found insufficient) to forbear publicke officiateing, and to apply himself to his private studies, which was sent accordingly.

" 6. A testimoniall was given to Mr. Nathaniel Rathband, in these words :

" These may certifie whomsoever it may concerne, that Mr. Nathaniel Rathband is very well known to us to bee orthodoxe in doctrine, painfull in his ministeriall function, and of pious and blameless conversation, and hath with good approbation for these twoe years last past exercised his ministry at Prestwich, within this Classe.

*" The 92d Meetinge at Manchester,
Septembre 12^o, 1654.*

" 5. It is agreed that these Ministers, whose names are subscribed, bee desired to attend the Classe at Manchester, ye seacond Tuesday in November next.

" Mr. Woolmer, of Flixton; Mr. Bradshaw, of Ellinbrooke; Mr. Clarkson, of Chorlton; Mr. Leadsome, of Didsbury; and Mr. Nuttall, of Stretford."

Homerton,

SIR September 20, 1824.

THIS day I have received a letter from Mr. Haldane, which puts me under an obligation to request insertion for a few sentences from it; otherwise one of my former communications (p. 476) will be likely to produce an impression, which I am most happy to find would be erroneous, with regard to the Council of State of the Republic of Geneva, and the Honourable Functionaries of that Government.

J. PYE SMITH.

—“ I trouble you with this letter, to notice a mistake in your statement, which it will be well to rectify; because it contains an accusation

against the Government there, for which there is no ground. During all the time I resided at Geneva, the Government never, in the smallest degree, offered any interference with me, either public or private.—You are perfectly correct in asserting that there was no previously-concerted plan of attack on the clergy of Geneva, as M. Chenevière has affirmed.—When I went abroad, I knew of no one who was going to travel with the same intention. For many years before, I had felt a strong desire to visit France, with the design of being of some use there, if possible, in the diffusion of the gospel. When peace came, I in consequence went to the Continent, having no other object in view; for I had formerly travelled there as much as I was inclined, to satisfy curiosity.—So far was my journey from being undertaken in consequence of a plan concerted with others, that, when I undertook it, I knew not where I should go. I had met with no one who could give me any information respecting the religious state of France. I was not acquainted with a single person on the Continent; nor had I an introduction to any one.—The openings for usefulness, that presented themselves in various quarters, were truly remarkable, and entirely unforeseen by me.”

SIR, *July 30, 1824.*

ACURIOS pamphlet of 56 pages in 8vo., lately printed in Philadelphia, being now in my possession, I send you an epitome of its contents, with some observations thereon. It is entitled, “ The Cabinet, or Works of Darkness brought to Light: being a Retrospect of the Antichristian Conduct of some of the leading Characters in the Society called Friends, towards that eminent and devoted Servant of the Lord, ELIAS HICKS, when on his last Visit of Gospel Love to the Inhabitants of the City of Philadelphia.”

It principally relates to the events briefly noticed in your Journal (XVIII. 229), and also contains a copy of the proposed American Quaker Creed, the nine last Articles of which are inserted in your last Number, (pp. 340—342,) with a plain and full exposure of the circumstances which led to the abortive attempt of a junta of elders to impose it upon their brethren. Ia

Sept. 1822, Jonathan Evans, whose name was afterwards intended to sanction the said Creed, at the close of a Meeting for Sufferings, informed a select party of its members, that he expected they had "heard that Elias Hicks had obtained from his Monthly Meeting a certificate to visit Friends in this city" (Philadelphia): and as it was "well known that he holds doctrines that are not the doctrines of Friends," it was "necessary some steps should be taken to prevent him from disseminating them among us." That he was "full of words," and that it would "answer no purpose to argue with him."

Having thus disclaimed reasoning as inexpedient and dangerous, in which opinion all his privately-collected audience appear to have concurred, he requested two of them to state what they had "heard from himself." On which they rose, "one after the other," and stated to this secret conclave "what *they said* were the doctrines held by Elias Hicks." On such evidence, this self-constituted Assembly proceeded to appoint several persons of their own body "to wait upon him as soon as he might reach the city;" two of whom called on him "very early after his arrival." At first, Elias denied their authority to question him, but upon their telling him they came in love, as brethren, he said he was willing to answer them; and after an interview of about fifty minutes, they went away, "*apparently well satisfied.*"* A deputation from a meeting

* Soon after this interview, the insidious plot, intended to obstruct Elias Hicks in his visit, by the aforesaid elders, having transpired,—in order to counteract its design, the following notice was inserted in several of the Gazettes:

"Philadelphia, Dec. 9th, 1823.

"Arrived in this city, on the 7th inst., ELIAS HICKS, a distinguished Minister of the Gospel, the benign doctrines of which he, as a faithful ambassador, has for many years past practically endeavoured (both by precept and example) to promulgate in its primeval beauty and simplicity, without money and without price. Those who are *Friends* to plain truth and evangelical preaching, that have heretofore been edified and comforted under his ministry, will doubtless be pleased to learn of his arrival, and avail themselves of the present opportunity of attending

VOL. XIX.

4 A

of certain "elders of the city" waited on Elias Hicks on the 9th, and requested him to meet them at Arch-Street House, at 3 o'clock, on the 11th. Elias declined meeting them, saying that "he did not acknowledge their authority to call him before them;" but at the request of a friend of his, "who thought it might be most satisfactory to Friends generally," Elias consented to meet them at Green-Street House, on the 12th of the same month, which he did with five of his friends, and about thirteen or fourteen of the members of Green-Street Monthly Meeting. "*All the elders of the city*, except Jonathan Evans, who was indisposed, and two others who declined meeting with them," appear to have been present. After sitting some time in silence, one of them said, "a serious concern had arisen among the elders, and they had requested a *select opportunity* with Elias Hicks;" instead of which, "he thought it very extraordinary that so many Friends should be present who had no concern in the case." He concluded by observing, "that if those Friends thought proper to keep their seats, that they (*the Elders*) had better withdraw." Elias Hicks then rose and observed, that "he thought it a very extraordinary proceeding that they should summon him before them to give an account of himself, in reply to flying reports against him, and not be willing to have those Friends present who were to be witnesses that those reports were false. He thought he had been cruelly treated since he came to the city. Friends had listened to reports, and judged him upon those reports." This manly and reasonable appeal seems to have produced no perceptible effect on these elders, for after Elias sat down, "a hint was again given that the elders might as well withdraw, if other Friends chose to stay." And one of them said, "Friends had better keep to one point, whether Elias would give them *the private opportunity they desired.*" After some few remarks, "Elias ob-

such appointments as he, under the direction of Divine influence, may see proper to make in this tour of gospel love to the inhabitants of this city and its vicinity.

"A CITIZEN."

served, he was not free to meet them *alone*," but "ready to hear any charge they had to bring in the presence of these Friends."

This candid offer and the defeat of their plan to hold a secret conclave appear to have produced "some confusion and evident irritation on the part of some of the elders, several of them rising to go out; and one of them said, '*The ministers are answerable to the elders,*' in a tone of voice evincing some excitement." To which Elias mildly replied, "I am answerable to my Friends at home. I have their certificate. *God makes ministers, but man elders*”—and some few words more, which the narrator says, "I did not hear, owing to the noise."

He adds, "The elders now all left the house, except Isaac Lloyd and Samuel Noble. Isaac Lloyd had, while all were together, expressed his disapprobation of the whole proceeding, in thus calling Elias before the elders: he did not understand what authority or right they had to act thus.

"After the others retired, there was a short pause, when Elias said, if those Friends who had just retired were to have the whole rule and government of ministers, and others were to be bound to submit to them in all things, it was time for Friends to take care of their rights, and not suffer themselves to be imposed upon." The persons present expressed "great unity and sympathy with Elias Hicks, as a Gospel Minister, and a desire that he might be encouraged;" and also, "that no resentment or hardness might be suffered to get in towards those Friends who had retired."

Before they separated, "Elias observed, that he felt thankful in saying he felt as much love for those Friends who had left us as he ever had done; and that if they had been actuated by any improper motives, (which he did not charge them with,) his prayer for them was, that they might be forgiven."

About two months before this, a MS., which nearly fills fourteen pages of "The Cabinet," intended privately to prejudice the leading Friends and elders of Philadelphia against Elias Hicks, was annexed to a letter addressed by Thomas Eddy to John Warder, of Philadelphia, dated "New York, 10 Mo. (Oct.) 18, 1822.

"My dear Friend,

"I send the annexed to thee in hopes it may be useful for such Friends as *thee* thinks proper to offer it, for their perusal; if approved by thee, it may be handed to any other Friends. Please see William Evans; shew it to him; and if he or any others wish to copy it, please permit them. If it would be more extensively useful, I have no objection that *ten copies be printed*. It was done in a hurry, and might have been improved, if I had time to copy it; however, it can be corrected with you. It may be of more use if it should not be known to be written by me, or that it came from New York. Elias gave large notice to have a public meeting at Newark, but the people knew his sentiments, and would not attend, except about a dozen of *the lower class*. Please see William Evans or Thomas Evans soon. I wish thee to write me soon. Thy son Benjamin will perhaps copy the annexed, so as it may not be read in my hand-writing. Letters addressed to me, as usual, at New York, will be handed me next day.

"Thy affectionate Friend,

"THOMAS EDDY."

The MS. annexed to the above letter was entitled by its author, "Facts and Observations illustrative of the present State [of the] Society in New York." The writer first attempts to shew, that, from the time of George Fox, the Society in Europe and America were uniformly preserved in a wonderful manner in love and amity. "This happy state of things lasted," says he, "till the time of Hannah Barnard's going to England, in the year [1799]. During her visit to Ireland, she introduced sentiments of unbelief as to some parts of the Holy Scriptures, on the weak ground that we are not obliged to believe what we cannot understand or comprehend; and finding a disposition in many to unite with her, she very soon manifested that she did not unite with the Society respecting a belief in the divinity of Christ." How, then, did it happen that no such accusation was taken up by any of the Committees or Meetings to whom her case was referred? It is true an elder, a supposed convert from the Wesleyan Methodists, openly accused her before the Morning Meeting of Ministers and Elders in London

in the year 1800, with holding Unitarian sentiments; but his proposal, not being seconded, fell to the ground.

Hannah Barnard was silenced in England, as a minister, for her testimony against war, with the aid of several supplementary charges, irregularly and improperly introduced, none of which had any connexion with Unitarianism. Nor was she disowned as a member of the Society in America on any such ground. Thomas Eddy next refers to the cases of "William Rathbone and Thomas Foster," each of whom he incorrectly asserts "published a book, taking part with Hannah Barnard, and advocating Unitarian doctrines, on which account they were both disowned."

He should have said the latter only, as no charge of the kind was alleged against William Rathbone, though he was well known to have been a member of the same Unitarian Book Society, eight or nine years before Thomas Foster became one of its members. It is not clear what Thomas Eddy means by his next accusation against Thomas Foster, whether it refers to his sober and serious remarks on the Yearly Meeting Epistle for 1810; or to his "Tract," entitled "Doctrinal and Devotional Extracts" from each of those Epistles from 1675 to 1810. The deputies of Ratcliff Monthly Meeting, as well as those of the Quarterly and Yearly Meetings, to whom his case was referred, alike declined to examine the conclusive evidence these Extracts contained of the collective sense of the Church, from the uniform manner in which it had annually expressed itself for so long a series of years. Nor has any direct attempt been yet made, that I am aware of, to weaken or overturn this evidence. Erroneously as Thomas Eddy has stated many circumstances relative to the case of Thomas Foster, when before the Yearly Meeting of 1814, which "he afterwards published," whether Thomas Eddy had ever seen the publication or not, he says, "It is allowed to be a tolerable candid and accurate statement of the whole proceedings," including "the whole that was said by himself, the respondents, and every Friend that spoke on the subject before the Meeting." If there be any truth in this statement, Thomas Eddy's account of the matter is wholly inde-

fensible. But his overcharged picture of the Separatists in Ireland, and of the case of T. Foster, was drawn, "in order to shew how decidedly the Society have shewn *their abhorrence of the doctrines advanced by them*; and also" that it "may be compared with the present state of society, within the limits of the Quarterly Meeting of Westbury," where Elias Hicks resides and has long been well known, and highly esteemed as a distinguished member and approved minister of the Society. By Thomas Eddy's account of the members of this Quarterly Meeting, they are mostly heretical enough to say, "We are not bound to believe what our reason *cannot comprehend*—till at length they boldly denied the *divinity of Christ*, and openly declared that his death and sufferings were not to be considered as a propitiatory offering for the sins of mankind, &c. &c. It may be truly said that within the *Yearly Meeting of New York*, as well as the *adjacent Yearly Meetings*, Friends were remarkably preserved in love and unity, until Elias Hicks disturbed that harmony."

How did he do this? Thomas Eddy, under the mask he had assumed, says, "by lessening the divine authenticity of the *Holy Scriptures*—the common but groundless aspersion against Unitarians. "And then," adds he, "when he (Elias Hicks) supposed he had sufficiently prepared the minds of the people, he came out with his Unitarian principles or doctrine, and shewed a wonderful fondness for speculation and reasoning." In proof of which, it seems, he "frequently asserted that he was not obliged to believe what our reason could not comprehend." The effect of his thus preaching the doctrines of the gospel in much plainness, as an intelligible revelation addressed to the reason of man, and not an unrevealed revelation, as some others represent it, is thus described by his accuser:

"The multitude always being fond of something new, ran after him wherever it was known he was to be at Meeting, as they were confident *he* could not be silent, owing to his having a remarkable acute memory," well stored I presume with a knowledge of the *Scriptures*, "diligent in the exercise of his gift," and having "by nature or rather by the gift of

God, the advantage of a great flow of words, and [a] ready utterance—he acquired great popularity; and in a little time his influence," says Thomas Eddy, "became *so extensive* that he dictated and completely directed all the business of the Yearly Meeting, and every other meeting of discipline he attended." The next accusation is *much more credible*. Following closely the example of the four evangelists, of the apostles, and their great Master, "he began by speaking of Christ as a great prophet," or *the greatest of the prophets*, "who had suffered martyrdom for his principles, as other prophets had done before his time."

His accuser adds, "At this period his principles *were discovered* by a number of Friends, but there were *many* that were so closely attached to him, that any person who passed censure on him," [for preaching the aforesaid scriptural doctrines,] "was sure to incur the frowns of his supporters. Some valuable Friends now regret that he was not checked at that period, but they are fearful *it is now too late*." It is much to be lamented, says Thomas Eddy, "that this step was not *timely adopted*, as it would have prevented the present unhappy divisions in New York and other places. He went on—printing and speaking of Christ as a mere man, and lessening the Scriptures on every occasion." After much irrelevant and not very credible matter, his accuser adds, "At length he ventured more openly to speak against *the divinity of Christ*, by stating, that he might have fallen as Adam did." It appears that "some worthy Friends of New York," and "other Yearly Meetings, and from Europe," have stated to Elias Hicks their objections to "his sentiments *relative to the divinity of Christ*," which, according to them, "went to the destruction of the Christian religion, and to produce divisions in [the] Society. But owing to his inordinate fondness for reasoning," says Thomas Eddy, this has not "been of any use." And that "although *many* Friends in New York, as well as *some* on Long Island, are convinced he is *unsound* in the Christian faith, yet *most of them are secretly afraid of him*." Such is the account given, as illustrative of the present state of the Society of Friends

in New York and the adjacent Yearly Meetings. "We may tremble," adds Thomas Eddy on behalf of himself and his confidential friends, "when we find such a man" as Elias Hicks "countenanced in advancing doctrines that *go*," in their estimation, "to destroy the foundation of our Society, and lay waste its first principles; and that he should be permitted to go to other places," where he is heard gladly by the multitude, and his doctrines generally approved and received as sound and scriptural, "to produce the same divisions that he has already produced at New York. The injury received through the conduct of this man has been very great. Highly respectable persons of other [reputedly Orthodox] denominations, charge our Society with being Unitarians: when they are told" by the comparatively few persons in the Society who oppose his ministry, that "this charge is untrue, they reply, they have heard Elias Hicks openly and publicly avow this doctrine, and as he is an acknowledged minister in the Society of Friends, and as they allow him to go about the country to hold meetings, of course the doctrines delivered by him must be considered as held by the Society."

In order to shew that "it is not so very extraordinary as might at first appear, that a great proportion of the people so educated and so instructed should submit to be led, and be so entirely influenced by such a man as Elias Hicks," and to account for "so many of the members of his Quarterly Meeting being so blind as not to discover the unsoundness of his principles," Thomas Eddy does not hesitate to say, "the leading cause is the want of a proper or suitable education; the writings of early Friends (except some journals) are scarce, and *little read*, all kinds of school learning, except reading, writing, and the first rules of arithmetic, *are discouraged*, as well as *general history*, and books written by persons *who are not members*." To read the Scriptures daily or at fixed hours, is declared to be "mere formality;" and he asserts, I hope also mistakenly, that in many families "they are very *little read*;" and with equal confidence declares, that "if Friends in Philadelphia," of whose religious education and instruction he makes no

complaint, "should allow this man" (Elias Hicks) "to visit families," which he afterwards did to very general satisfaction, "and in this way to spread his poisonous principles, divisions among them *will assuredly be the consequence.*" The quotation from Pennington may possibly prove that he adopted the indwelling scheme, or the Sabellian system, but nothing more, in relation to the doctrine of the divinity of Christ.

Thomas Eddy says, lastly, that "during the time George Withy," a minister from this country, was "in New York, many of those who have uniformly appeared as zealous supporters of Elias Hicks, shewed themselves highly displeased with George, and — charged him with preaching wrong [or unscriptural] doctrines." They "were exceedingly disturbed," says Thomas Eddy, "that George should have told Elias that his sentiments went to destroy the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion. In order to support Elias, they published one thousand copies of William Penn's Sandy Foundation Shaken, as they said, to shew that the Unitarian doctrine held by Elias Hicks, agreed with what was advanced by Penn." That these persons so published this celebrated work of Penn's, may be safely credited on the testimony of Thomas Eddy. He disapproved its publication, yet bears witness to the fact, in a circular specially intended for his particular friends, and others holding similar sentiments, and alike intolerant.

Many of your readers are so well acquainted with the strong, clear, definite, and scriptural character of this work, as to enable them readily and decisively to judge what doctrines alone it is calculated to support. I may hereafter send you another paper relative to this controversy among the American Friends, their reception or rejection of those doctrines, for openly avowing which, Penn suffered imprisonment at the suit of the Bishop of London, but for promulgating which, he never was, that I can find, exposed even to a breath of censure from the Society of Friends, with whom he was then, and long after, in the nearest religious unity and fellowship.

BEREUS.

SIR, July 12, 1824.

I READ with equal pain and surprise, a letter in your Repository, (pp. 201, 202,) dated from Bristol, and signed *A Friend to Sunday-Schools*, in which the writer charges the Unitarian body with a manifest indifference, if not aversion, to the instruction of the poor—in other words, to Sunday-Schools. This he maintains to be a fact, and a lamentable fact. Many strange observations respecting the inconsistency of Unitarians are offered by him to the public, and particularly in connexion with the causes of what he is pleased to call the tardy progress of Unitarianism. This tardy progress he ascribes in a great measure to "negligence in the education and in the *purity* of the education of the youthful poor," amongst us. We are, then, accused of aversion to, and neglect in, the momentous duty of education as it relates to the poor, and an *impure method* besides, in the management of it.

This, Sir, is a heavy charge, and yet appears to carry inconsistency upon its face. But, the author proceeds to make the following appeal to the Unitarian public:—"How is it, I would ask, that so few of our magnificent and spacious places of worship can boast of having spacious school-rooms appended to them? How is it that our public donation lists teem with items in favour of ministers and chapels, and almost every other praiseworthy object, and not a solitary one applicable to that of Sunday-Schools? Does not this seem to indicate that the Unitarian grants, tacitly at least, to his Trinitarian brethren the pre-occupation of the vulgar minds of the lower classes of society to implant and cherish those very stamina which constitute his chief complaint, whose eradication is his greatest difficulty? Or, that he permits the most vigorous portion of their existence to run out in the debasing, unregenerative torpor of 'blessed ignorance,' until they are incapacitated for the reception of any thing opposed to that prevalent but pseudo-proverb, 'Vox populi vox Dei'? And is not the large expenditure in the erection of chapels, and the education and support of ministers, like the providing of hospitals

and physicians for the *cure* of a malady which timely exertions might have *prevented?*" The writer of the letter before me further considers, that an "odium is industriously levelled against Unitarians, that theirs is not the religion of those to whom the gospel is proclaimed to be peculiarly adapted, 'the poor of this world;'" and that it has "but a too solid foundation on the ground which he has taken;" and asks, "on what principles or reasoning, and from what motives can a Unitarian maintain an indifference to the education of the youthful poor?"

There is a Postscript added to the letter, in which the author admits, "that there are exceptions to the *general application*" of his remarks: and he cannot but name an honourable and exemplary one—"Birmingham." Now, Sir, I do most positively deny the correctness of his general statement as to the *facts*, and the conclusions which are drawn must consequently fall to the ground, and with them, I trust, the odium which they were fitted (I hope not designed) to fix upon the Unitarian body, or those Christians who maintain the Unity of God in one Person.

In the first place, I know of no Unitarians (and I have a pretty general acquaintance with them) who are "either averse or indifferent to the education of the youthful poor," and I never *heard* before I saw the letter from Bristol, of any who are of this description. 2dly. I know not of any large and populous town where they have places of worship, with which places of worship, Sunday-Schools are not connected. 3dly. I know but of very few of the country or smaller places of worship, and of none in my neighbourhood, in which Sunday-Schools are not established. I am a resident at Sheffield. In that town the Unitarians have supported a Sunday-School during the last fourteen years. Similar institutions are united with all their chapels in the vicinity.

With respect to *public donations* and their non-insertion in the lists of charity, "which teem with *items* for ministers and chapels," &c., they are not found amongst them for an obvious reason. They *need* them not; and their conductors would be ashamed

to apply for any foreign support. The young men and women of the respective congregations are the teachers, and in some cases, the old scholars themselves: and all this is done *gratuitously*; and, as far as practicable, on the *Lancasterian plan* of education. Annual sermons and collections supply what may be further wanted and required. I hope, Sir, your Bristol correspondent, if hereafter he should step forward as the advocate of any liberal institution, will be careful neither to commit himself nor injure others, by hasty or illiberal aspersions, and will connect his advocacy with a zeal that is *according to knowledge*. VERUS.

SIR,

WITH your approbation, I propose furnishing the Monthly Repository with a course of papers, containing desultory remarks on all the articles which it contains, beginning with the series of the present year. I have for some time been an eager and a constant reader of your Magazine, and have frequently wished that I could sit down and dispatch to you a few of my reflections on different subjects, as they occurred in my perusal of it. But the distance of time which must necessarily elapse between the writing of a communication on this side of the water and its publication on the other, has always appalled me. I have been discouraged at the thought, that my remarks on any particular article must come lagging in, several months after the appearance of the article itself, and thus lose perhaps the principal advantage they might generally possess, in the freshness of interest attached to the topics under discussion.

The plan, however, which I now propose to adopt, will gratify my own morbid desire of scribbling, and, if tolerably executed, may have the good fortune to co-operate in some of the excellent purposes of your interesting Journal. I may presume that your readers will have sufficient curiosity to peruse a regular synoptical review of your numbers, even at the distance of six months from their publication. Although most of my remarks, suggested by the discussions, and views, and style, of your correspondents, would be too insignificant to be sepa-

rately transmitted across the Atlantic, yet, being accumulated and embodied by their connexion with an object of so much importance as the Repository, they may possess sufficient reflected interest and borrowed weight to deserve your notice. Perhaps yourself and contributors may not be destitute of curiosity to learn the continued judgment of a stranger respecting your intellectual efforts; on the supposition, I mean, that you find him endued with any of the qualifications requisite for his assumed office. How far it would conduce to the improvement and good regulation of any magazine to contain within its own pages a department of the kind proposed, I leave to your skill and experience, as an editor, to determine. Should you approve of the plan, and be dissatisfied with the execution of the specimens I now forward you, I hope you will engage some of your accomplished friends and fellow-subjects to fulfil my project to your better acceptance. In the mean time, I shall, for my own amusement and improvement, continue my pleasant task in the manner I have commenced it, and should I find that my advances have been received, I shall gladly submit my little labours in this way to your future disposal. Unless I am mistaken, the destiny of the Monthly Repository is yet to be loftier and happier by far than that of any other existing periodical. Its exact adaptation to the liberal and expanding spirit of the age, its freedom from paltry and sectarian *pledges*, the unwearyed homage which it always and every where pays to TRUTH, and the unrivalled importance of the subjects to which it is generally devoted, will unquestionably cause it to remain a consecrated arena for the exercises and encounters of strong and thinking minds, and a favourite publication with all those readers who are anxious for satisfactory views in matters the most intimately connected with human happiness. With these prophetic expectations as to the splendid destination of your journal, you will not wonder that I have attempted to become one of its regular contributors, and sought some mode by which to "Pursue the triumph and partake the gale."

AN AMERICAN.

[Some of our readers may suspect a stratagem in this communication, but we assure them that it is the genuine production of an American correspondent, of which indeed the internal evidence will be abundant. The writer is known to us, and his name, were we at liberty to publish it, would give weight to his strictures. We cannot help feeling a little pleasure (the reader will pardon us!) in our Transatlantic correspondent's flattering estimate of our humble labours. He is a candid but not blind critic, and we and our coadjutors may read his animadversions with a better feeling than curiosity, and derive some improvement from the calm observations of a wise and friendly Looker-on. ED.]

Monthly Repository for Jan. 1824.

Chenevière's Defence of the Genevan Church. This is perhaps drawn up with a little too much acerbity. There is no doubt that the liberal divines of Geneva have had enough to provoke them, but their apologist has scarcely performed his task with sufficient dignity. After all, it will be difficult for English and American Unitarians to enter with perfect sympathy into the feelings of their injured Genevan brethren. Our notions of church-government partake so much of independence, that we can scarcely help revolting at seeing even a fiery Calvinist dragged before a human tribunal for proclaiming his opinions in ever so offensive a form. However, in judging of the merits of this case, we must recollect the state of society at Geneva, and the notions and habits in which both parties have been educated. As far as we can trust this *ex parte* testimony, M. Chenevière has made out his case very clearly, and shewn that much moderation, forbearance, and propriety, have been exhibited by the Genevan Consistory.

Mr. Cogan on Revelation. Ingenious, powerful and comprehensive. I admire all this writer's communications.

Philadelphus on Future Suffering. A very candid, frank and decent expression of doubts and suggestions that occurred to the author's mind on a subject perhaps more interesting than any other to mankind. In some

of his thoughts quite ingenious, though eccentric.

Notice of Mr. Woods, very interesting.

Sir Isaac Newton's unpublished MSS. This paper filled me with new emotions of admiration at the character of the great philosopher.

Mr. Wallace on Isaiah ix. 6, 7. Very fine. The error respecting Hezekiah's age seems to be clearly pointed out, and ably corrected.

The Baptismal Text. I allow the strength of many of this writer's reasons against the text, but cannot enter with him into his extreme views of its incompatibility with Unitarianism.

Mr. Rutt—deserves sympathy. I know of one person who intends very soon sending for a copy of the new edition of Priestley's Works.

An Old Subscriber on Mr. Gorton's Work. I have never seen Mr. Gorton's book, and therefore cannot judge of this article.

Dr. Evans on Mr. Irving's Orations—Interesting.

Friendly Correspondence between an Unitarian and a Calvinist. Some beautiful specimens of amicable and humble feelings in this portion of it.

Dr. Carpenter's recommendation I approve, and shall take care to become a subscriber to, or procure two copies of Mr. Wright's Life.

Letter from a Muggletonian. Some orthodox doctrines carried to their legitimate results.

Hints to Unitarians. Excellent; as I have often thought in reading them before, where they first appeared;—but all out of the way in ascribing "self-complacency" to the Monthly Repository.

Poetry. First Article, rather a happy translation.

Second and third, of no ordinary excellence.

Hymn to the Holy Alliance, might have been left in the Daily paper where it first appeared.

Obituary Notices. Of Mrs. Hosmer, exquisite.

Intelligence. Indian Memorial.—Highly curious and interesting. The government of that country will one day repent of the oppressive measures to which this memorial relates. Remember how the American Revolution began.

Negro Slavery. Mr. Buxton is

aiming at impracticabilities. I have lived in a slave-country five years. If he had done so as many weeks, I think he would have modified many of his projects. Does even Mr. Cooper think them all wise?

Monthly Repository for Feb. 1824.

Professor Chenevière's Defence.—The personal attack on M. Malan here is quite unnecessary and offensive. I must say that such a method of proceeding would have proved injurious to the Professor's cause in my own mind, had not the facts and documents which follow, set the conduct of the Consistory in a favourable light.

Notes on Scripture. Generally very good. I do not quite feel the propriety of the explanation given of "the clouds returning after rain."

Report of the Committee of Dissenters. Worthy of the subject.

Mr. Jevans's recommendation to insert Jehovah in the English Bible, very laudable, but carries almost an air of irony with it, in consequence of the obstinate prejudices and indifference of the age with regard to this subject. It is somewhat like exhorting the Papists not to wave incense before their bit of bread.

*Dr. Evans on Hall's Life of Tol
ler*, is a charming specimen of fair and good-natured criticism, and puts the eloquent Baptist entirely in the wrong.

Cornish Correspondence. Manifestly some misunderstanding, hastiness and personal exasperation, if not error, on both sides. But good, we must trust, will come out of evil.

Extract from Everett's Europe—Judicious.

Mr. Wallace on Isaiah ix. 6, 7. No. II. Strong and well-supported, if not absolutely convincing, criticism.

Mrs. Hughes on Philadelphia. Unnecessarily and unjustifiably severe, besides implying a censure on the general character of the Monthly Repository, which is scarcely ever destitute of some articles analogous to that here attacked.

Epitaphs. Rich.

Thoughts on the Connexion between Poetry and Religion. A most exquisite Essay, and evidently the production of a highly accomplished and philosophic mind. The author should be taxed, if possible, to contribute one

such article to every number of the Repository. If he is now young, (and there is at any rate a juvenile purity and elasticity in the spring of some of his thoughts,) how much promise does he hold forth!

Mr. Rutt's Remarks on anonymous signatures is very sensible and well-timed.

Correspondence between a Unitarian and a Calvinist. No. II. The style of this Unitarian is of a very high order. It displays rather a rare combination of power and ease. Sometimes his shafts are too cruelly pointed. But how can we help forgiving him when he is ready the next moment to confess, and ask pardon for his error? Besides, a little sarcasm, if ever, may be indulged to the opponent of a man, who seems inspired with a kind of morbid and horrible delight in taking the gloomiest views possible of the purposes of heaven. Is there a darker or deeper expression of sublime despair in any metaphysical romance of the Godwin school, than this—"I expect, that if I do not most faithfully and unreservedly make the confession [that God might justly condemn him for ever], *God will oblige me to do so by making me feel the deprecated evil*?" This is, indeed, the concentrated essence of Calvinism.

Mr. Frend's suggestions in reply to Mr. Wallace are generally just. In one of his remarks I do not entirely agree. He says, "I cannot apply the word superstition to any thing which our Saviour thought worthy to adopt." If the expression *adopt* were here exchanged for *originate*, I could join in the sentiment. But it appears to me quite compatible with the object of our Saviour's mission, that he should *adopt* forms of speech, of which the *origin* had been superstitious. We find that he made no attempts to alter the received phraseology respecting demoniacal possessions. In fact, the settlement of the right meaning of terms was too insignificant an object for him to dwell upon. All his instructions seemed to bear upon the most important and essential principles of ethics and religion. Other questions he left to the decision of critics and philosophers, since the natural reason of man is sufficient for

VOL. XIX.

4 B

such purposes. On these accounts, I can easily conceive him falling in with the customary mode of designating the Supreme Being, in the country where he was himself born and educated, even though that mode might have been traced to a superstitious origin. If I may judge from my present impressions with regard to his errand and character, the prescription of new forms of speech would not a little have lowered his dignity, and thrown a shade or two of doubt on the divinity of his mission. His business was with things, not words. He came rather to remind us of such principles as these, that anger and lust are, at times when we little suspect it, equivalent to murder and adultery,—that the *character* of God is a combination of infinite moral perfections,—that the Jews were radically mistaken in their conceptions of the true Messiah,—and the like.

Mr. Sturch in Reply to Mr. Cogan appears to me to adduce some objections which are rather popular and superficial than profound. The controversy between these gentlemen I believe might be shewn to be principally of a verbal character, and I have no doubt that the interchange of a few good-natured arguments will bring them both to one goal.

I firmly believe, with Mr. Cogan, that modern Deists owe much of their boasted light to revelation; not entirely to Christianity, however. The Unity of God, I am persuaded, was revealed in some mode or other to the oriental world. It is a conclusion to which mere reason could never demonstratively arrive. I would rather allow that the belief of the doctrine is instinctive, or accidentally conjectural, than that it can be inferred from any premises within reach of our experience and reason. Paley's argument from *unity of design* has always struck me as deficient. It would go to prove that a whole city was built by one architect. A *diversity* of design is quite as apparent in the operations of nature and providence, as unity. On the other hand, I cannot allow to Mr. Sturch that Cicero possessed a conception of the Deity at all corresponding with the vast, and all-embracing idea of him which is taught us by Jesus Christ and his religion. Those

clear, philosophical and elevating views of the character and attributes of God, which are now spreading through the world, in despite of a thousand accompanying errors both of metaphysics and phraseology, can be traced, I believe, by no fair mind, to any other source, than the doctrines of the New Testament. It is true, their progress has been very much assisted by the speculations of John Locke, but his achievements consisted rather in shewing the correspondence existing between the religion of nature and that of the New Testament, and in exhibiting limitations and facilities for the right developement of truth, than in the discovery of divine truth itself.

Obituary. These notices must possess no little merit, since they interest a stranger at the distance of three or four thousand miles.

Intelligence. The Memoir of Werner furnishes some apt illustrations of the Essay on the Connexion between Poetry and Religion in this very number.—The allusion afterwards to American Jews causes me to observe, that persons of that denomination are found in some of the most responsible civil situations under our National and State Governments; they are also officers in the navy and army, editors of some of our most popular newspapers, and teachers of excellent schools, to which Christians send their children with as little repugnance as to those of their own creed.

—
Plymouth,
SIR, September 6, 1824.

I AM obliged to your correspondent (p. 474) for pointing out an error in the Lectures on Nonconformity, as I shall be most truly obliged to any person who, either in this public manner, or by private communication, will inform me of any thing in which I have mistaken my subject. In all cases of historical statement we are under a necessity of using the autho-

rity of others, and the best we can do is to select what we believe to be the most correct. I have endeavoured to do so, but not without the fear, that I should err in many particulars; and although I did regret that the first edition of the Lectures went no farther than four hundred, yet I am now satisfied that it is better it should have been so; since it will be in my power, as it shall be my endeavour, to make the next edition more comprehensive, more correct, and, therefore, more complete than the first.

Let me beg your correspondent to state rather more particularly, which, if he pleases, he may do in a letter addressed to myself, wherein the great difference between my statement of the Bishop's election, and that which he has given, consists—to justify his saying that mine is *erroneous in every particular*. I may not have expressed myself in legal terms; but if the word *permission* were changed for *order* or *authority*, it seems to me that I have not erred; unless I have falsely stated, that a religious service is connected with the act, in which the assembled Bishops unite in asking the aid of the Almighty to make a proper choice—while they are compelled to follow the instructions of their earthly head. Do they, in a prayer appointed for the purpose, pray for the Divine assistance, or do they not; and do they, after they have obeyed the Monarch's command, thank God for having directed them in the choice of so worthy a person? I suppose it must be in this that I am *erroneous in every particular*, but I will correct myself if in this fact I have trusted to a false authority.* I solicit his reply.

I. WORSLEY.

* I have said, "not daring, at the peril of losing their preferment, to choose any other." It seems that it should be "at the peril of the penalties of a *prémunire*."

REVIEW.

" Still pleased to praise, yet not afraid to blame."—POPE.

ART. I.—*A Reply to Two Deistical Works, &c. &c.* By Ben David.

(Continued from p. 480.)

IN Chap. VI., Dr. Jones attempts to prove that Christianity is the religion of Moses and the Prophets refined and perfected by Jesus Christ, and that Philo and Josephus are historians and apologists of the Gospel under the name of Judaism.

To meet the objection to this latter hypothesis, that these two writers make no mention of Christianity, and pass over in silence the miracles, and even the name of Jesus, Dr. Jones not only contends that this was the most politic, and indeed the natural course for them to pursue, but also justifies them by the example of Christ himself:

" Our Lord seems to have discouraged his apostles from mentioning his name in circumstances which would render it prejudicial to his cause. The charge which he gave to his disciples, that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ, Matt. xvi. 20, is thus recorded by Mark: ' And he charged them that they should speak to none about him,' viii. 30. According to this statement, our Lord's meaning may be thus interpreted: ' In as much as many will hate me, though without a cause, do not speak about me to such people. Cherish, indeed, a firm faith in my Gospel, and imitate my example; but do not make my name and character the subject of conversation and dispute on occasions where no good can be answered, but rather where prejudices will be riveted, and animosities kindled.'

" It is a remarkable fact, that our Lord has at least by his example discouraged his followers to mention his own name in our addresses to the Almighty; and if the beautiful and comprehensive model of prayer which he has prescribed, had been found in the works of Josephus, it would have been considered by modern divines as a proof that the author was not a believer in Christ. The name of Jesus is omitted also in the parable of the Prodigal Son; and if it had been found in Philo, and not in Luke, it would have been considered as an infallible proof that Philo was not a Christian. For it delineates the conversion of the Gentiles; and though that

conversion was effected by Christ, as the immediate instrument in the hands of God, yet his name is not mentioned therein. The leading object of that beautiful parable, is to set forth the placability of God, and his readiness to accept every returning sinner on the simple terms of repentance and reformation: and we shall see the propriety of its being related by Luke, when we consider that Luke published his Gospel in Egypt: for *there* principally the universal Father was blasphemed as arbitrary and cruel; *there* the men represented by the prodigal son were most debased by vice and superstition; and *there*, as we learn from Philo, multitudes of them were returning to God. From this, moreover, we see the reason why the Gentiles are called the *younger son*. In Gen. xxv. 23, Rebecca is said to have in her womb two sons, the one, namely, the elder, representing the Israelites, the other, or the younger, the Egyptians. See Rom. ix. 10."—P. 71, Note.

We are not disposed to raise a cry of presumption, and the like, against our author for his singularities, but really our candour is a little tried when we find the following preface (part of which we must put in italics) to the argument on behalf of the hypothesis that Philo and Josephus were Christians:

" In speaking of these two writers, *I am not forming an hypothetical or improbable case.* Philo and Josephus, contemporaries with Christ and his apostles, and men, as it is well known, of the first rank, integrity and talents, have, by their immortal writings, in fact realized the above hypothesis. *This is not a matter of supposition: it is not a question of mere curiosity supported only by probable evidence.* Their works are extant; and if we attend to them, and not to the authority of learned men, *we shall find that they are historians and apologists of the Gospel, with the same certainty as that the sun is in the firmament at noon-day.*"—P. 72.

The arguments for Philo being a Christian are, that both he and Josephus strip religion of rites and ceremonies, and make it consist in piety and virtue, which no Jew before the time of Christ thought of, and to which the apostles were brought with

difficulty; that he speaks, in common, with the sacred writers, of the Logos, the son and image of God; that he describes a society of apostles or missionaries, under the name of *Therapeuta*, engaged in the reformation of the world; that persecution was raised in Egypt against these men, and that they were sold as slaves; that their character, tried and proved by their sufferings, could be no other than that of the primitive Christians; and that, according to Philo, they prevailed throughout the globe, sharing with Greeks and Barbarians their own consummate blessings.

The author maintains that Josephus was a Christian because he represents the law as consisting of moral principles; because under the denomination of Jews he speaks of the apostles, and describes their travels and labours; because he speaks of a future and better life, which Dr. Jones pronounces (we think unwarrantably) to have been wholly unknown to the Jews before Christ; because he relates in the tone of an advocate the death of James, the brother of Christ; and because his language explains the history of the apostles and primitive Christians, only hinted at by Luke in the Acts, at Antioch. The silence of both Josephus and Philo as to our Lord's miracles and those of his apostles, is explained by the prevalence of the belief in demons and consequently in prodigies, and the improper use which the Heathens, to whom Josephus addressed his writings, made of the Christian miracles; and the reserve of these supposed Christian apologists is pertinently compared with the caution recently observed by the Indian Christian Reformer, Rammohun Roy, who, judging his countrymen disqualified by their erroneous notions of God and the laws of nature, for drawing the proper inference from the miracles of Christ, compiled for their use and in order to their conversion, a work, which, passing by miracles, points out the Precepts of Jesus as the Guide to Peace and Happiness.

Dr. Jones vindicates of course the genuineness of the disputed passage in Josephus relating to Christ, and as this is a very important subject we shall quote the passage, with our author's remarks upon it: such read-

ers as wish to see the pro and con in this dispute may refer to Lardner and to the appendix to Kippis's Life of him prefixed to the octavo edition of his Works.

"The same prejudice at Rome and in other places induced Josephus to give an account of Christ, and to bear testimony to his virtue, his wisdom and his works. 'About this time existed Jesus, a wise man, if, indeed, he might be called a man; for he was the author of wonderful works, and the teacher of such men as receive the truth with delight. He attached to himself many of the Jews and also many of the Greeks. This was the Christ: and though at the instigation of our leading men Pilate condemned him to the cross, yet such as loved him at first did not cease to love him; for he appeared to them after three days again alive, the divine prophets having foretold this and innumerable other marvellous things concerning him: and the people who from him call themselves Christians have not fallen away.' A. J. Lib. xviii. C. 3, 3.

"During a whole century this famous passage has been the subject of much dispute in every country throughout Christendom, till at length those, who agree in nothing else, came to agree in this, that the paragraph is the forgery of some Christian in the third century: nor, perhaps, is there a man of any estimation in Europe who thinks it the production of Josephus. The arguments that led to this conclusion are principally the two following:

"'This is the work of a Christian, which Josephus was not.' The assumption is erroneous: Josephus was a believer in Christ, and his immortal works bear testimony to his being the historian and apologist of the Gospel. In his book against Apion he relates that a pure system of worship and morals, issuing from Judea, had in his days pervaded the world; that there was scarcely a family among Greeks or Barbarians into which this system had not forced its way; that those who received it equalled, if not excelled, in zeal and attachment to it, the very people who taught it; that the foundation of it was a future state foretold by Moses and afterwards confirmed by a mighty proof given by God himself; and, finally, that this doctrine supposed not the immortality of the human soul, but the renewal of being to mankind after a revolution of ages. But the author does not say what was the nature of the strong proof which God gave of a future state, but only that it was foretold by Moses. In the above paragraph, however, he supplies this omission, and tells

us that Christ, at the impeachment of the leading men, was condemned to the cross; and that notwithstanding he appeared to his followers after three days again alive; and that these, with other marvellous things concerning him, had been predicted by the divine prophets: and this is precisely the history of Christ and his religion, as far as we can gather them from the New Testament.

" But it is said that this testimony of Josephus was not quoted by any Christian writer before the days of Eusebius in the third century. True: but the more early Greek and Latin fathers had sufficient reason for not quoting it. Josephus was an apostolic believer; he received and embraced the religion of Jesus in its purity. And he not only excludes the doctrines of his divinity and miraculous birth from the history which he gives of our Lord,—and by this exclusion he shews them to be foreign to his Gospel,—but in the context he brings to light the origin of those doctrines, and brands the base authors of them with infamy to the end of time. Justin Martyr, Origen and others, knew this to be a fact, and they passed over the testimony of the Jewish historian in profound silence, lest in an age when the transactions were fresh in the memories of men, the secret should transpire, and the very foundations of the orthodox faith be blown up as with gunpowder by the illustrious historian of the Jews. Time, however, removed the events to which Josephus refers from the knowledge of men; and after three centuries ecclesiastical writers feel themselves safe to quote the authority of Josephus.

" The objections made against this disputed passage would never have been made, had these things been known: they originated in misconception; and the real character and views of Josephus being at length brought to light, they fall like a dead weight to the ground; and there they will remain, a monument of the temerity and mistaken views of those who urged them. Nor should I omit to mention that the style of the passage is in exact unison with the very peculiar style of Josephus; the same conciseness and comprehension, the same dry and unvarnished detail of facts, distinguish it, which distinguish all his other works. Nor can any suspicion arise against its genuineness, from the want of authentic evidence. The same historical testimony authenticates it which authenticates all the works of Josephus, no manuscript, no version, no copy being ever known to exist without this celebrated paragraph. When men talk of forging a passage in Josephus, they surely talk without due

consideration. A spurious paragraph might have been inserted in those copies which the Christians possessed; but could they do the same with those in the possession of the Jews? And what Jew ever possessed the works of Josephus which did not contain the testimony he bears to Jesus Christ?"—Pp. 87—90.

The object of Chapters VII. VIII. IX. and X., is to shew that the anti-christian system was introduced into the several churches established by the Apostle Paul. Some of the principal arguments here introduced have been already submitted by the author to the readers of the *Monthly Repository*, which renders it unnecessary for us to attempt an abridgment of them. They are besides critical and consecutive, and no epitome scarcely could be rendered intelligible.

Chap. XI. is designed to shew that the writings of Paul have been and are perverted in support of anti-christian doctrines, and is in our judgment a most important and valuable part of the work. It contains an examination of passages, in relation to the doctrines of the divine nature of Christ, of justification by faith and not by good works, of the effect of Christ's death as an atonement for sin, of election and predestination, of original sin and the natural depravity of man, and of the gospel being a mystery incomprehensible by human reason; all which the author contends the apostle so far from supporting, endeavours to set aside.

We must content ourselves with one extract:

" One of the principal features in the character of God, I repeat, is exemption from death or immortality; and the purest Greek writers often use Θεος, *God*, in this sense. Thus Bion. Idyl. I. 53: καὶ Θεος εμμι, καὶ οὐ δυναμαι σε διωκειν, *I am a God, and cannot follow thee.* It is the language of Venus to Adonis now dead, and means that being immortal she cannot die. See Acts xxviii. 6. Sophocles, OEd. Tyr. 871, wishing to express that the laws of Jupiter are eternal, says, μητας ου τετοις Θεος, *in these there is a great God.* It is thus that we get at the real meaning of the following much-disputed passage: 'Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh.' 1 Tim. iii. 16. On this pas-

sage I beg attention to the following remarks :—1. This paragraph, it is allowed, refers to Jesus Christ : but the Apostle cannot mean to hold him forth as *a god*, because in the context, and in all his epistles, he writes against men who taught his divinity.—2. His language implies that Christ was *flesh*, that is, he was a mortal being, or a being subject to death and corruption.—3. The Apostle asserts not the *nature*, but the *resurrection* of Christ : ‘God was made manifest in the flesh—was justified by the spirit, attested by angels ; that is, angels declared his resurrection to the women, and his own angels or heralds attested his resurrection to mankind—was preached to the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received in glory.’—4. That, as the writer alludes to the resurrection of Christ, he must mean to affirm the immortality of Christ ; and this is what his language, agreeably to the strictest rules of criticism, implies. There is, says Sophocles, a great God in the laws of Jupiter :—and what does the poet mean ? He means that the laws of Jupiter are incorruptible and eternal. ‘A God,’ says Paul, ‘made himself manifest in the flesh.’ And what again, I ask, does the Apostle mean ? He means that Christ, who was a mortal being, by his resurrection proved himself immortal : and hence he brings to light the mystery contained in the language of Moses, that man, who is mortal, will prove immortal ; that in Christ, beings who are corruptible, shall put on incorruption, and those that are mortal shall clothe themselves with immortality. In this passage, then, there is nothing said of Christ, but what will be verified in all mankind, when Christ shall return to raise the dead. Nor should it be omitted, that the Greek philosophers, alluding, it appears to me, to the enigmatical representation of Moses, or, as others may think it more probable, to the immortal nature of the soul, call man, by way of enigma, or mystery, *ὁ Θεὸς Τρυπτός, a mortal God.* This language is used by Heraclitus of Pontus, known for his affected obscurity or paradoxes, and after him by Hierocles ; see Clement of Alexandria, Poed. Lib. iii. C. i., and the Golden Verses imputed to Pythagoras, vers. 63, 70.”—Pp. 155—157.

We have now brought the reader to the end of the First Part of Ben David’s work, and are obliged to defer to the next number the examination of Part II., which consists of a more direct reply to the *soi-disant* Gamaliel Smith.

ART. II.—*On the recent Prosecutions of Persons vending Books against Christianity. An Address to Deists.* 8vo. pp. 34. Odor. ls.

WE regret that this judicious and valuable tract should have escaped our notice so long. The friends of genuine Christianity have always lamented, that coercion should ever have been employed in its defence, and we are extremely happy to meet with so able a writer who, however he may differ from us respecting particular tenets, has on this very important subject, the same views and feelings as ourselves. We deem the subject highly important, because we regard it as essential to true religion that its profession should be perfectly voluntary : that the mind should be under no bias whatever from external circumstances, but should be induced to make an avowal of its belief, if disposed to avow, solely from a conviction of the truth and importance of what is maintained.

The anonymous author of this pamphlet, while he readily acknowledges his persuasion that the writings of unbelievers have a tendency to effect incalculable mischief, clearly shews by a number of references to the Christian Scriptures, that those Sacred Writings altogether discountenance such a mode of defence as that of inflicting pains, penalties and imprisonment, for opposition to their authority. He shews that the support of the civil power, in any manner whatever, is inconsistent with the spirit and principles of the Christian religion ; that it requires no adventitious aid, and admits of no defence but reason and argument ; that *any* other assistance or protection is only calculated to injure its cause, to strengthen the hands of its adversaries, to multiply their converts, to increase and confirm the prejudices which the unreflecting may have imbibed against revealed religion, and to diminish the force of the strongest evidence which can be adduced of its truth.

We would earnestly recommend this pamphlet to the serious attention of every description of readers, whether believers in Christianity or unbelievers ; whether advocates for unlimited freedom in religious discussion, or for the occasional interference of the civil magistrate. All will find in it

matter of serious reflection and worthy of more attention than they have probably ever been induced to give to the subject. Both unbelievers and the sincere but misguided advocates of intolerance may learn from it, that true religion, though it may suffer persecution, never persecutes; and that all attempts to suppress opinions by force, only tend to augment the evil which they are intended to remedy.

We have not space for more than a short extract. In the following passage, the most effectual means of counteracting the efforts of infidelity, are well though briefly described:

"If checked at all, it must be by the same means by which it will ultimately be vanquished: it must be by a decided, but unostentatious display of primitive religion. Let the spirit of Christ actuate his ministers; let the regulations of Christ govern his churches; let the doctrine and precepts of Christianity controul the hearts and lives of its professors; and Infidelity will soon hide its blank and gloomy countenance, ashamed of the contrast between itself and the genuine, uncorrupted religion of the Redeemer."

ART. III.—*A Funeral Discourse, delivered at Crediton, Devon, June 20, 1824, on Occasion of the Death of Mrs. Davy. By J. Johns.*

Job xiv. 14.

THIS is a discourse, short indeed, but of a very superior character: and if the gentleman who delivered it have as much eloquence on his tongue as he has shewn with his pen, in the composition of this tribute of respect to the pious dead, it cannot have been heard without the deepest feelings of sensibility mingled with Christian hope and joy; nor can we wonder that these pages have met the public eye, "at the particular request of the family." The subject of death is in every Christian pulpit of necessity a thread-worn subject; and where the congregation is numerous, it is not in every one's power to offer that which is new and striking upon these solemn occasions. We are usually indebted to the tender state of the feelings with which the society enter the church, on the occasion of a funeral discourse, far more than to the superior excellence of the address or

the novelty of the matter, for that favourable view which is generally taken of funeral discourses. They are then, in general, interesting when the character of the dead affords a peculiarly instructive lesson to the living. The present discourse shall shew its own merits, and relate the circumstances under which it was delivered:

"Although, my fellow-christians and friends, the services of this morning have already spoken the solemn farewell of religion over the dust which we have so lately committed to the ground*—there are those present who may well claim from me, that I too should not pass over this dispensation in silence: and after what is passed, it would be doing violence alike to their feelings and my own, were I to touch this day upon a chord less solemn. I feel that I speak in the midst of friends, who will be gratified by this passing tribute to the memory of the dead; and who will hear me with their accustomed indulgence and attention, while I endeavour, however imperfectly, to speak to their hearts the voice of the grave."

After referring to the appeal which death, even in ordinary cases, makes to the living, he proceeds,

"But the present is no ordinary occasion, and it ought to be met with no ordinary feelings. The sepulchre is at all times expanding, before, around, and (let us never forget) beneath us too: but there is seldom laid low a tree so full of the good fruits of time, as that which has so recently felt the axe of the spoiler. Ninety long years of active, pious and honourable life, is not a sacrifice which is every day offered upon the funeral altar to the Searcher of hearts; and it was to make this mournful but majestic offering, that the gates of the tomb have again been opened, to enclose once for all the mortal relics of her, who now only lives to God."

Then stating some of the circumstances of her life, in which "she had supplied to her family a father's un-

* As this venerable lady had always conscientiously adhered to the principles of Calvinistic dissent, it became the office of her respected pastor to notice her loss to his congregation. But as it was expected that a greater number would attend than their place of worship would conveniently contain, application was made for the use of the Unitarian Chapel, in which the service was performed in the morning by Mr. Davies.

timely loss, and united the virtues of the other sex to those of her own."

"Many of you have seen her in the maturity of life, health and usefulness.—I have only known her in her years of decline. Of all that she was in brighter days, I have only looked on the venerable ruin; but that ruin was venerable indeed: and the winters of almost a century had left *that* behind them which, once beheld, could never be forgotten. Her heart was young, warm and pious to the last; and they who beheld her will often remember the brow, so eloquent of the peace of virtue, and so prophetic of the rest of heaven. It was not my privilege to see her on the death-bed; but I have been told—and did not require to be told it—that the calm of death was beautiful there—of *death*, my friends, did I, or ought I to say? Oh! it is not to a transition blessed and gentle like hers, that we ought to attach the name of *dying*. Rather let us say, like our Lord over Lazarus, when we speak of her soft and hallowed repose,—'Our friend sleepeth.'—She sleepeth, and her slumbers are long, dark and profound, but they are also sorrowless, and calm and holy. She sleepeth, and not a dream can break upon her repose,—but the sunshine of hope and the smile of heaven are bright upon the cold and narrow bed. Her aged lip had tasted the dregs of the cup, her trembling foot had reached the barriers of mortality, and who would call her back, not to *enjoy* but to *endure*, since she has *wasted all the days of her appointed time*? Oh! what, my friends, when the honey is exhausted, what is there to attach the bee to the flower?"—"In such a case who can regret that *her change is come?* Or, if it be not to *such* that the palm of eternity is given, 'who then *can* be saved'?"

"Link after link is struck from the chain of life—flower after flower drops away from the wreath of love—and it is the lofty duty of the mourner to prove, that all these sorrowful but merciful admonitions have not been given and received in vain. They should teach us not to remit, if we have commenced—not to defer if we have neglected—the all-involving improvement of our appointed time. They should impress upon us, that mortality is not an insulated, but a relative state—that life should be the germ of an immortal flower, and time the pathway to the paradise of God. In the spirit of these sublime convictions, it should be our prayer, under every successive bereavement, so to be taught to number our days that we may apply our hearts to wisdom: and, with the relics of the departed, we should endea-

vor to bury our frailties, as the holiest evidence of surviving love."

"It is not *in life* only, my fellow-believers, that we are to 'wait all the days of our appointed time, till our change come'—This must also be done *in the grave*. There the hallowed dust, which has so newly been remanded to its primal mould, reposes with the pious dead of all ages and climes till the magnificent system of Providence be accomplished, and the eventful consummation of prophecy shall arrive."—"Centuries may pass over her narrow bed, the green trees beside her place of rest may mingle with the consecrated earth beneath them, and the stately pile in whose shadow she reposes may crumble, stone by stone, under the finger of time—all these may pass away, and fade from the face of the earth like a forgotten dream: but amid these prospects let us remember, with deep and thrilling emotion, that the word of our God shall stand for ever. Still, still, my brethren, over all the wreck of change and time, the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth; and the voice which said, 'Let there be light,' in the infancy of nature, will repeat the lofty fiat over the clouds of the tomb. He will not leave the souls of His children in the grave, nor suffer His holy ones to see corruption."—"The pale cold brow will be radiant with life, the clouded eye will be bright with celestial smiles, the tremulous foot will be elastic with perpetual youth, and the soul, never more to be enervated by decay, will partake of happiness transcending its hopes, and of glory beyond its dreams. The burial-ground of the just and the pure, is, in the noblest sense, *the garden of God*. There reposes the seed which is destined to produce the future blossoms of heaven; those blossoms of the spirit, which will bloom under the bright shade of the tree of life, and render back again to the breezes of paradise the incense borrowed from the breath of heaven."

After speaking of the duty and the use of grief, when it is excited by love and sanctified by religion, he adds,

"The great gulf which is fixed between life and the grave ought to make us cling more to the remembrance of the lost, since it is all of them that now in this world remains. The claims of past affection should never be less sacred, because the dead are unable to enforce them; and the bower which memory builds over the urn, though it may and must be dark with sorrow, yet oh! let it ever be green with love."

"Return then, my friends, to the la-

hours and the duties, which the solemnities of dissolution have broken. Return to exemplify resignation by obedience—and to prove your trust in the loving-kindness of God, by the use which you make of the blessings which remain. Return to lay to your hearts the warning lessous of mortality—to emulate the good deeds of those for whom you mourn—and to wait, as they have done, in faith, charity and hope, all the days of your appointed time. And let it be your prayer, that whenever your earthly change shall come, tears, as pure as those you have shed this day, may be wept by your families upon your own fresh graves."

ART. IV.—*Richmond, and its Vicinity. With a Glance at Twickenham, Strawberry Hill, and Hampton Court.* By John Evans, LL.D. 12mo. pp. 294. Printed for J. Darnill, Richmond; and sold by Simpkin and Marshall, London.

DR. EVANS'S active pen has here furnished us with another of those little volumes that make our walks and rides interesting. Such a vade mecum appears to have been wanted by the visitor of Richmond,
 "Imperial seat of ancient grandeur—
 Rich diamond sparkling in a golden vale :" "Richmond that sees a hundred villas
 rise
 Rural or gay."

The author has omitted nothing that belongs to his pleasing subject, and has introduced many anecdotes and reflections that tend to put the reader in good humour and to excite candour and benevolence.

We have room for only one extract, but that will be allowed to be a rich one.

"The WAKEFIELDS, already mentioned as interred in Richmond church, are the Rev. *George Wakefield*, M. A. together with his sons, the Rev. *Gilbert Wakefield*, B. A., and the Rev. *Thomas Wakefield*, lately deceased.

"The Rev. *George Wakefield* was minister of this parish, as well as vicar of Kingston. The Rev. Mr. Bailey, of Langley, Derbyshire, gave him the livings, assigning this reason to his friend, who reproached him for not taking them himself, 'No,' says he, 'I am satisfied with my present situation. Now were I to go to Richmond, the KING would be my parishioner: I must consequently go to court. Then I shall be looking forward, of course, to a prebend or a

VOL. XIX.

4 C

canony. As soon as I am settled in a stall, I shall grow uneasy for a *bishopric*, and then eager for a translation to a better. In due time LAMBETH will be the fond object of my wishes, and when I am stationed there, I must be miserable because I can rise no higher! Had I not then better be quiet in my present condition, than be always wishing, always obtaining, but never satisfied?' This anecdote is perhaps not to be paralleled in the annals of clerical preferment. The worthy divine was a truly *Apostolic Bishop*, having learned the lesson of Christian contentment.

"The Rev. George Wakefield has a monument with this inscription:—'The REV. GEORGE WAKEFIELD, eighteen years rector of St. Nicholas, Northampton, and nine years vicar of Kingston and minister of this parish, died the 10th of February, 1776, aged fifty-six; and his wife in 1800.' It is a plain tablet, in the chancel, and the record is an appropriate tribute of respect to his memory, for he appears to have been esteemed by his parishioners. He was a man of plain good sense, benevolence, and piety.

"The Rev. *Gilbert Wakefield* was renowned in the republic of letters. The inscription on his monument is an epitome of the history of the deceased—

"In the adjoining churchyard, at the east end of the chancel, lie the remains of GILBERT WAKEFIELD, A. B., formerly Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, third son of George Wakefield, A. M., late vicar of Kingston and minister of this parish; he died September 9, 1801, aged forty-five. Simplicity of manners and benevolence of temper, united with eminent intellectual accomplishments, greatly endeared him in private life. To the public he was known by high attainments in *biblical* and *classical* literature, and the honesty and intrepidity of his endeavours to promote the cause of truth and liberty. Sustained by the affection of numerous and estimable friends, as well as by the testimony of conscience, he endured with fortitude a state prosecution, and two years' imprisonment, for his *REPLY to the Address of the Bishop of Llandaff to the People of Great Britain*. Returning from the county prison of Dorchester, with an unbroken spirit but impaired strength, and resuming his accustomed exertions, he sank under them fourteen weeks after his enlargement. The expectation of *immortality* by the Christian covenant, and the remembrance of his conscientious life, enabled him to meet *death* with complacency! His loss, irreparable to his wife and children, was deeply regretted by all his friends and relations.

“ Thomas Wakefield, B. A., the minister of this parish, erects this *memorial* of his brother's desert and his own affection.”

“ *MISS AIKIN*, niece to the celebrated Mrs. BARBAULD, and author of several popular historical productions, penned the following elegant lines to his memory—

“ Friend of departed worth, whose pilgrim feet
Trace injured merit to its last retreat,
Oft will thy steps imprint the hallow'd shade,
Where WAKEFIELD's dust, embalm'd in tears, is laid.
‘Here,’ wilt thou say, ‘a high undaunted soul
That spurn'd at palsied caution's weak controul,
A mind by learning stored, by genius fired,
In FREEDOM's cause with generous warmth inspired,
Moulders in earth—the fabric of his fame
Rests on the pillar of a spotless name!
For you who o'er the *sacred marble* bend
To weep the *husband, father, brother, friend*,
And mutely eloquent in anguish raise
Of keen regrets his monument of praise,
May faith, may friendship, dry your streaming tears,
And virtue mingle comfort with your sighs,
Till *resignation*, softly stealing on
With pensive smile, bid lingering grief be gone,
And tardy TIME veil o'er with gradual shade
All but the tender tints you would not wish to fade!

“ I knew this excellent man, and he is deserving of the reverence of posterity.

“ The Rev. *Thomas Wakefield* has also a neat monument, near the pulpit, with this appropriate inscription—

“ Reader—THIS MARBLE is sacred to departed excellence, and was raised by the parishioners of Richmond to perpetuate the name of *THOMAS WAKEFIELD*, B. A., who for *thirty years* was their minister, their guide, and their friend! If aptly thou art conscious of congenial virtue; if, like him, thou art *pure, just, beneficent, liberal, and pious*, upright with man and humble with *God*—reflect and rejoice, that while thy recompence is certain in heaven, thy memory shall be cherished upon earth! *THOMAS WAKEFIELD* was born the 18th of December, 1751, and died the 26th of November, 1806.”—Pp. 79—84.

ART. V.—*A Gazetteer of the most Remarkable Places in the World; with brief Notices of the principal Historical Events, and of the most celebrated Persons connected with them: to which are annexed, References to Books of History, Voyages, Travels, &c., intended to promote the Improvement of Youth in Geography, History, and Biography.* By Thomas Bourn, Teacher of Writing and Geography, Hackney. 3rd ed. 8vo. pp. 984.

TOO much importance cannot be ascribed to books of education. Insensibly, they form the national character. And in this view the aspect of the present times is peculiarly encouraging; a marked improvement having of late years taken place in the elementary books that are put into the hands of young persons.

To this pleasing change the late Mr. Butler (see *Mon. Repos.* XVII. 571) and his family, to which the present author belongs, have largely contributed. The works that have issued from this school, and they are numerous, are full of interesting information, and encourage a taste for literature, and inculcate the genuine feelings of humanity and just principles of morality and religion. There is scarcely a page in any one of these manuals that does not record some important fact, or relate some pleasing anecdote, or contain some “elegant extract.”

Mr. Bourn's “Gazetteer” is not merely occupied with longitude and latitude, with the names of kings and queens and ministers of state, and with notices of antiquity: he has enriched his descriptions with every kind of literary and biographical reference—subjoining in most cases his authorities. We give a few specimens, taken at random:

“ *BIRMINGHAM*, a large town in Warwickshire. It is noted for its hardware and japan manufactories, and for the steam-engines made by Boulton and Watt. The Birmingham goods are exported in great quantities to foreign countries, where, in point of cheapness and show united, they are unrivalled.—*WARNER'S N. Tour.*—In 1791, a tumultuous rising of the populace, in consequence of several festive meetings taking place on the anniversary of the demolition of the Bastille to celebrate that event, destroyed

two meeting-houses, and the dwellings of Dr. Priestley and other Dissenters.—AIKIN'S *Annals*, I. 437; Dr. COOTE'S *Mod. Europe*, I. 315.—Boulton, a celebrated manufacturer and practical engineer, was born at Birmingham in 1728, and died there in 1809.—*Supp. Ency. Brit.*—Pratt, author of *Gleanings, &c. &c.*, died at Birmingham in 1814.—*Europ. Mag.* LXVI. 414.—Hutton, the venerable historian of Birmingham, died at Bennett's Hill, near that town, in 1815, at the age of 92.—*Mon. Mag.* XL. 280; *Gent. Mag.* Sept. and Oct. 1815."

"BOSTON, the capital of Massachusetts, North America. It is a flourishing town, containing about 3600 inhabitants,* and was the birth-place of Franklin, in 1706, a philosopher who explained the theory of lightning, and promoted with the utmost zeal the spirit of opposition in the Americans, to the government of Great Britain.—Dr. COOTE'S *Mod. Europe*, I. 118.—When Franklin, by means of a kite, identified lightning with the electric fluid, he confessed that the moment in which he did so was, of all others, the most exquisite he had ever experienced.

" Led by the phosphor light, with daring tread,
Immortal Franklin sought the fiery bed ;
Where, nurs'd in night, incumbent tem-
pest shrouds ;
The seeds of thunder in circumfluent
clouds ;

* Evidently an erratum. Morse (Amer. Geog. 2nd ed. Lond. 1792) stated the population of Boston at 14,640; and Tudor (Letters on the Eastern States, Boston, 1821) assigns reasons why the town now "contains only 43,000 people," adding, "If the population within a square of thirty miles, including Boston, be counted, all of which has its centre of business in that place, and with which a very active daily intercourse is kept up, it would probably be nearly equal to that of any similar extent in the United States."

ED.

Besieged with iron points his airy cell,
And pierc'd the monster slumbering in
his shell.

Amusements in Retirement, 240; DARWIN.

"In the American war, Boston was taken by the English, and retaken by the Americans. On the 1st of June, 1813, Captain Broke, in a frigate called the Shannon, captured an American frigate called the Chesapeake, after a short but bloody conflict, off the port of Boston.—AIKIN'S *Annals*, II. 410.—70. 33. W. 42. 25. N."

"WALTHAMSTOW, a pleasant village in Essex, about 4 miles N. E. from London. Dr. Cogan, who first directed the attention of his countrymen to the possibility of recovering persons apparently drowned, and, in conjunction with Dr. Hawes, founded the Humane Society, died here in 1818."

"WANTAGE, a town in Berkshire, about 11 miles W. from Wallingford. Here King Alfred was born in 849.

"Sure every Muse and every Grace will
join
With votive hands the fairest wreath to
twine—
Cull, with assiduous toil, the choicest
flowers,
And hang the brightest garland on her
towers :
While grateful Liberty shall love the
shade,
Her guardian-chief, where fostering virtue
laid ;
And Britain's Genius bless the hallow'd
earth,
Which gave her patriot king, her Alfred,
birth.

PYE'S *Farringdon Hill*, B. ii.

"Kimber, an eminent Dissenting Minister, and author of a valuable abridgment of the History of England; and Butler, the most profound thinker that ever sat on the episcopal bench, and author of "The Analogy of Religion," were born here in 1692.—*Beauties of England*."

POETRY.

ON THE DEATH OF MRS. GEORGE KENRICK.

And is it thus, and is it thus
We're doomed thy sainted form to see?
O desolating thought for us !
O sweet and blessed sleep for thee !
Thy heart is still—but ours are torn—
Thou art in heaven ; and we forlorn.

Thy virtues like a crown of light,
 Beamed in full glory round thy head ;
 We never deemed a thing so bright
 Could die so soon—and thou art dead.
 Thou, dead ! and we are left alone
 'Neath overpowering grief to groan.

And whither, whither shall we turn
 From sorrow that hath pierced us thro' ?
 We meet with none but those who mourn,
 And vainly ask for comfort too !
 We weep—they weep—but hearts that bleed
 Far other consolation need.

Angel ! when from her throne above
 She looks upon our cell below,
 'Twould break her bliss, 'twould wound her love
 To see us thus desponding. No !
 We'll bear it all—as 'neath her eye,
 That now regards us from the sky.

And if some bursting tear should stray
 Down our pale cheeks—some struggling sigh
 Break forth—we'll wipe that tear away,
 That sigh subdue, and smilingly
 Look up to heaven and feel we share
 Her bliss unutterable there.

Thou gentle Spirit ! in thy course
 There were no rocks, no ruggedness—
 Nor strife, nor sorrow, nor remorse,
 But all was pleasantness and peace ;
 For all was calmest virtue. Thou
 Ne'er gav'st our hearts a grief, till now.

Not long ago thy blue eyes met
 The fading sun, when evening spread
 Its hues of light—He never set
 More calmly, than upon thy bed
 Of death thou sinkedst, when thy even
 Waned, and thy spirit flew to heaven.

The autumnal flowers look smiling on—
 There's life and joy in field and wood ;
 Yet she who waked their smiles is gone—
 We wander forth in solitude !
 Mock not our woes, sweet flowers—but hear
 And sympathize with our despair.

Despair ? O no ! 'tis thoughtless,—vain—
 In every flower and field and tree
 We'll trace that lovely smile again,
 Which beamed upon them, Saint ! from thee.
 Yes ! stars and flowers and all that's fair
 Thy image holds, thy name shall bear.

Some star that's brighter than the rest,
 Some flower whose fragrance never dies,
 Shall blend them with thy memory blest,
 Shall consecrate thy obsequies,
 And hourly as we think of thee
 These shall thy sweet memorial be.

Sept. 23, 1824.

B.

A PARAPHRASE OF THOMSON's "HYMN."

The Seasons as they change, O Lord !
 Thy boundless power and love record,
 And speak thy skill divine !
 Thy presence dwells in all we see ;
 The rolling year is full of Thee ;
 And all the earth is thine.

Forth in the Spring Thy beauty goes
 And o'er the face of nature throws
 Thy tenderness and love ;
 Wide flush the fields, the softening air
 Breathes balm and fragrance everywhere,
 And lifts the soul above !

Then all the Summer's charms arise ;
 We see reflected from the skies
 Refulgent heat and light !
 Thy sun, from its exalted sphere,
 Shoots full perfection through the year,
 And charms the raptured sight.

In Autumn, too, Thy bounty shines,
 In golden fields, and cluster'd vines,
 And all its produce gives :
 With plenty loads the fruitful ground,
 And spreads one common feast around
 For every thing that lives !

In Winter, awful dost Thou grow,
 And storms and tempests, as they blow,
 Majestic darkness cast !
 'Tis then we hear Thy whirlwinds roar,
 And see the humbled world adore,
 And feel Thy northern blast !

Mysterious round ! what force divine,
 What might and majesty are Thine !
 What vast, surprising skill !
 Such love and harmony appear,
 That, though we trace them every year,
 Thy wonders charm us still.

Yet, wandering oft with thoughtless gaze,
 Unconscious, man the scene surveys,
 Nor marks Thy mighty hand ;
 Nor sees Thee in the changing years,
 Nor deems that the still varying spheres
 Revolve at Thy command !

He sees profusion in the Spring ;
 Sees Summer all its ardour bring,
 And Autumn's produce given ;
 He hears the Winter's blast resound ;
 Sees Nature's glories strew the ground ;—
 Yet looks not up to Heaven !

Nature attend ! join every soul
 Beneath the sky, from pole to pole,
 In adoration join !—
 And ardent raise one general song
 Ye gales, which sweep the earth along,
 And breathe a strain divine !

O, talk of God in secret shades,
Where silence every part pervades,—
The pine scarce waves its head,—
And sacred awe prevails around,
And every step is holy ground
Where Faith delights to tread.

And ye whose voice is heard afar,
Say whence ye come, and whose ye are,
And who has bid you roar !
Lift high to Heaven the impetuous song,
And in your boldest notes prolong
His praise from shore to shore !

Nor brooks nor rills the strain refuse,
And let me catch it as I muse
Beside your banks so fair:
Ye headlong torrents, dark and deep,
Ye softer floods that silent sleep,
Jehovah's praise declare.

And thou, majestic main, arise,
And sound His praises to the skies
Who swells thy rolling tide !
Whose greater voice or bids thee roar,
Or bids thee calmly kiss the shore,
When winds and waves subside.

Soft roll your incense, herbs and fruits !
While every flower its fragrance shoots,
In mingled clouds to Heaven !
Whose sun exalts, whose breath perfumes,
Whose showers refresh, whose light illumines,
By whom your tints were given.

Ye forests, bend ! ye harvests, wave
To Him who all your produce gave,
And ripen'd all your store !
And let your silent praise impart
A secret joy to man's glad heart,
And bid his spirit soar !

Ye stars, effuse your mildest ray,
As through the vault of Heaven ye stray,
And glow with sacred fire !
And, while ye speak your Maker's praise,
Their sweetest songs let angels raise,
And strike the silver lyre !

Great source of day ! as round the world
We see thy glorious light unfurl'd,
Praise Him who bade thee shine !
Let every beam His love declare,
Who placed thy lamp of brightness there
To speak His power divine !

Ye thunders, sing His praise aloud,
And, echoing back from cloud to cloud,
Inspire the swelling gale !
Retain the sound, ye rocks and hills !
Praise Him who all creation fills,—
Whose kingdom shall prevail !

Ye groves and woodlands, all awake,
 And at the strains of music break
 From your remotest shade !
 Let every creature,—earth and air,—
 That boundless power and love declare
 Which all his works pervade !

But chief, let reasoning man proclaim
 With lofty songs his Maker's name !—
 Let crowded cities raise
 One general, one harmonious song,
 And through the extended earth prolong
 The great Jehovah's praise !

And ye who seek the rural shade,
 And court the cool, sequester'd glade,
 There feed devotion's fire !
 Unite, the tribute just to pay,
 The shepherd's flute, the virgin's lay,
 And the poetic lyre !

For me,—if I forget to raise
 The voice of prayer, the song of praise,
 And every change to greet,—
 O let my fancy paint no more !
 My tongue be mute, my joys be o'er !—
 Forget my heart to beat !

Should Fate compel my steps to stray,—
 Bear me to distant climes away,—
 To regions wild and bare !
 Where'er I dwell, where'er I roam,
 I find a Father and a home,
 For God is everywhere !

E'en to the farthest verge of earth
 He gives the vast creation birth,
 And boundless love declares !
 In cities full, or barren wastes,
 Man all his Maker's bounty tastes,
 And all His mercy shares !

And, at the last, the solemn hour,
 When death, with irresistible power,
 Shall bear my soul away
 To wing its long and mystic flight
 Through realms of gloom, and shades of night,—
 I cheerful will obey !

I cannot go where Endless Love,—
 Sustaining all yon orbs above,—
 Smiles not on all around ;
 Educing good from seeming ill,
 And better thence, and better still,
 To time's remotest bound.

But let me cease my feeble song,
 Nor thus th' unequal strain prolong,
 The fruitless anthem raise !
 I lose myself in heavenly light !—
 O let me curb my daring flight,
 And silent muse His praise.

Totnes, Devon, June 11, 1824.

WRITTEN AT SUNSET, JULY 30, 1824.

Lo, the sun's triumphal car
 Bears the victor from his war ;—
 Yet a moment he delays
 O'er the last of vanquish'd days,
 Rearing, on the west's blue shore,
 To his God one trophy more :
 Golden banners here are twining,
 There rich clouds, like arms, are roll'd—
 Fiery arms that burn in shining,
 Shield of light and sword of gold.
 Pause and view yon pile sublime
 On the field of conquer'd time.

Pause and look, with no vain gaze,
 Where goes down the last of days :
 Read the moral, writ in fire
 On the day's proud funeral pyre.
 Life is like the vanished sun ;
 Swift as that, its race is run.
 Like the clouds, which veil'd the azure
 Of the day for ever pass'd,
 Tears and trials dim the pleasure
 Of man's hours, until the last.
 Trace and learn the lore sublime
 On the scroll of parted time.

Enter, like the lord of day,
 On thy brief, but lofty way.
 Scorn, like him, each dusky cloud
 Weaving round a transient shroud :
 Pass, like him, serene and high,
 On the march that wins the sky.
 So shall every cloud surrender
 All its gloom at evening hour,
 Verging, in one pomp of splendour,
 Round the light that spurn'd its power.
 List, oh list, the voice sublime
 From the grave of buried time !

Crediton.

A BALLAD,*On the Irish Superstition of a Child changed by Fairies, by Mr. ANSTER.*

[From "Researches in the South of Ireland." By T. C. Croker. 4to. pp. 86, 87.]

The summer sun was sinking
 With a mild light calm and mellow,
 It shone on my little boy's bonny cheeks,
 And his loose locks of yellow.
 The robin was singing sweetly,
 And his song was sad and tender ;
 And my little boy's eyes as he heard the song
 Smiled with a sweet soft splendour.
 My little boy lay on my bosom,
 While his soul the song was quaffing :
 The joy of his soul had ting'd his cheek,
 And his heart and his eye were laughing.

I sat alone in my cottage,
 The midnight needle plying;
 I feared for my child, for the rush's light
 In the socket now was dying.

There came a hand to my lonely latch,
 Like the wind at midnight moaning,
 I knelt to pray—but rose again—
 For I heard my little boy groaning!

I crossed my brow, and I crossed my breast,
 But that night my child departed!
 They left a weakling in his stead,
 And I am broken hearted!

Oh! it cannot be my own sweet boy,
 For his eyes are dim and hollow;
 My little boy is gone to God,
 And his mother soon will follow.

The dirge for the dead will be sung for me,
 And the mass be chaunted meetly;
 And I will sleep with my little boy
 In the moonlight churchyard sweetly.

OBITUARY.

July 5, the Rev. Dr. JOHNSTON, minister during a long period of the Church and Parish of North Leith; respected and beloved as a pastor and revered as the patron and founder of the Asylum in Edinburgh for the Industrious Blind.

— 19, the Rev. THOMAS FLEMING, D.D., one of the ministers of Edinburgh; a zealous preacher of the old school, a man of varied talents, and a Christian of fervent piety and unquestioned virtue.

Aug. 2, in the 30th year of his age, and 5th of his ministry, the Rev. A. WAUGH, M.A., late Minister of the Presbyterian Church, Miles's Lane, and son of Dr. Waugh, of Wells-Street.

— 11, at *Bristol*, at an advanced age, ANNE, relict of Howell Wynne HUGHES, of London, optician. In the early part of her life, she suffered under unexpected trials and affliction, from the imprudence of one with whom she was nearly connected; but her mind was one of uncommon strength and steadiness, and Providence graciously tempered them to her feelings by a large over-balance of succeeding blessings and mercies. Though born and educated in the bosom of the Established Church, she became, while young, a convert to the doctrines of Unitarianism. Her father, a beneficed clergyman, died while his children were young, and the family continued, un-

doubtedly, to entertain the same opinions which he held, till the time when his son had nearly finished his studies at Cambridge, and was soon to be ordained. His widow, who had a mind equally serious, penetrating, humble and candid, was then led, with her daughters, by their intimacy with the Rev. Edward Harries, (for a memoir of whom, see *Mon. Repos.* Vol. VII. p. 118,) to doubt whether they had not hitherto, on some very material points, misapprehended the plain and obvious doctrines of Christ and his apostles. Their friend was then in possession of two livings, and performed the duty of the church in the village where they resided. He was still inquiring himself, but became daily more and more convinced that Unitarianism was the *doctrine of the gospel*, and from time to time gave up reading those parts of the Liturgy which he judged to be unscriptural; and so far were his hearers from objecting to this, that not only the people of his own parish regularly attended, but as many others as could be accommodated with places in the church.

This went on for several years, till an anonymous letter sent to the Bishop of the diocese brought a remonstrance from him, which caused Mr. Harris to resign his livings. But long before this happened, Mrs. Hughes, with her mother and sisters, were become convinced and zealous Unitarians. When her marriage caused her to remove to London, she regularly attended the excellent Theophilus Lindsey and Dr. Disney, in Essex

Street, and esteemed it a high privilege and enjoyment so to do.

After her return into Shropshire, the death of her highly-valued friend Mr. Harris, and the removal of a most respectable family who had formed a part of his seceding congregation, Mrs. Hughes and her younger sister carried on a regular weekly service in their own house, which was highly satisfactory to the family, and to those of their neighbours who chose to attend; and the number of their hearers rather increasing than falling off, it was continued till their removal to Bristol in June 1819. Her state of health and apparent strength was such as led her family and friends to look forward to a continuance of her valuable life for years to come. But He who "doeth all things well," thought fit to order it otherwise. And her sorrowing relatives and friends feel that they have abundant reason for thankfulness, that the sufferings which necessarily attend a protracted illness were not deemed needful for her, and that at last she was released from the cares and toils of mortality by a momentary struggle, probably unfelt by herself.

Her family must ever cherish the most grateful feelings towards their friend, the Rev. J. Rowe, for the very eloquent and impressive service delivered at Lewin's Mead on the Sunday following the funeral. It was deeply affecting; yet it strengthened their best feelings, enabling them to rise above selfish sorrow, in the consideration of that bright and glorious hope which the Scriptures assure us the "righteous hath in his death."

M. H.

Aug. 25, at Chichester, Miss SHIPPAM, a member of the Unitarian Church in that city. The value of her views of Christian truth was vividly displayed, during a very long and severely painful illness, which she bore with the most perfect resignation to the will of her heavenly Father. The present and future world were connected in her mind as the evening and morning of a day: she looked forward, in consequence, with holy joy, to the period of the resurrection, when she hoped to be reunitied to her Christian relatives and friends, before the throne of that Being to whom her prayers, evidently with increase of benefit and comfort to herself, were earnestly and frequently directed. Medicine was impotent, and parental anxiety vain, to arrest the progress of disease; but, blessed be God, revelation declares, "The maid is not dead, but sleepeth."

Aug. 25, at his residence, *Castle Hill*, aged 61, JOHN LEES, Esq. It would be a task attended with some difficulty to mention a character even in this enterprising neighbourhood who has united with great mental energy such industrious and persevering qualities as those the deceased possessed. Early in life and in the very infancy of the cotton business he became a spinner. With an ardour peculiar to his disposition and a strong discernment of what machinery rendered practicable, he was one of the foremost to avail himself of its peculiar advantages. He had the good fortune to connect himself with three other partners, all of whom became exceedingly successful in the trade, and to whom altogether the village of Stayley Bridge owes the establishment of its eminence and prosperity.

Having married when quite a young man, the stimulus of an increasing family urged him to the nicest calculations in the economy of his time, and the regulations he introduced in this respect amongst a very numerous class of workmen have been attended with the best effects both to themselves and to their employers. As a master, he was strict in discipline, requiring regular attention and uniform obedience to the orders he prescribed. But it ought not to be omitted that when Sir Robert Peel's bill for limiting the hours of labour in cotton factories became a law, it had nothing to redress in those under his controul. With such a knowledge of his business, derived from its first principles, and enlarged by every new improvement with which that business has been connected, the accumulation of a large property ceases to be matter of surprise. To himself it was attended with no other advantage nor valued for any other purpose but that of increasing the comfort and promoting the welfare of his family and his friends.—As a father, he was ever kind and affectionate; as a husband, early attached and sincerely devoted to a most estimable wife. She along with a numerous family remain to derive that consolation under his irreparable loss which the remembrance of his virtues and his amiable qualities will always afford them. With his children he relaxed the authority of the parent to enjoy their more unrestrained intercourse as a friend. To them he was always communicative, and except the time necessarily occupied with his concerns abroad, he had all his enjoyments at home. With a mind so constituted and talents kept bright with action, and which continued to wear so well, it will be naturally inferred that he was a valuable companion. His table was ever one of the most hospitable, and himself never so happy as in the society of his

friends, when he could get a company of them to surround it. Ah, how transitory is all human felicity! He who gives this imperfect tribute to the memory of another of his valuable neighbours, may himself soon disappear, and "shall shortly want the generous tear he pays." The inquiry after him will then be in similar language to that of a part of the text used on the mournful occasion of the funeral of the deceased—"Where is he?"

W. H.

Dukinfield, Sept. 14.

Sept. 13, at his house, near *Chester*, the Rev. JAMES LYONS, formerly minister of the Unitarian Congregation in that city. (Some further particulars in our next.)

— 18, aged thirty, at her father's house, *Larkbear*, near Exeter, MARGARET, the eldest daughter of Charles Bowring, Esq., and wife of the Rev. Geo. KENRICK, of Maidstone. An obituary is so often the record of transient feelings—feelings excited by severe but passing sorrow—exaggerating the virtues and veiling (amiable delusion!) the defects of those who are inseparable alike to praise and blame—that the writer scarcely dares to speak of her (for he must speak most unworthily!) whose life was one uniform course of virtue and happiness—serene and holy. She had many friends, for every body was her friend who knew her; and yet a being lives not who ever wished a word unuttered which had escaped her lips, or a deed undone which had marked her earthly pilgrimage. It was her privilege to pass a life—long in its enjoyments, though so short in its duration—unruffled by vicissitudes and tranquil as her own sweet spirit. Calamity seemed to respect her as it flitted by, and sympathy with the sufferings of others engrossed those sorrows which most of us have to give to our own. When gradually sinking under insidious and wasting disease, her mind lost none of its moral beauty: pleased by every act of kindness—complacent under every pain—cheerful—thoughtful—grateful—happy—she slumbered into death, as an infant slumbers—while at the moment of her exit the light of heaven seemed sparkling in her eye, the smile of eternal peace passed over her countenance—and the struggle was over. The spirit is in thy hands, O Lord!

— 19, at *Chelsea*, HENRY COOPER, Esq., Barrister. He was taken off by a short illness in the prime of life. He had overcome the difficulties of his profession,

and was rising fast into eminence. He was already leader on the Norfolk Circuit. His death is a loss to the country. In him the oppressed were always sure of an undaunted, an ardent, an able advocate—one whom no considerations of expediency, no desire to gratify power, would ever have induced to compromise the cause of his client. He had been sometime employed in procuring materials for a *Life of Lord Erskine*, with whom he was particularly intimate. It is feared that he had not made much progress in the work.

Sept. 23, at his house in *Burton Crescent*, JOHN CARTWRIGHT, (commonly known by the name of Major Cartwright,) the undeviating friend of civil and religious liberty. Had he lived to the 28th inst., he would have completed the 84th year of a consistent, virtuous life. He was the third son of William Cartwright, Esq., of Marnham, Notts; was a Commander in the Royal Navy; and formerly Major of the Nottinghamshire Militia.

— 24, at *Toxteth Park*, near Liverpool, MRS. ROSCOE, wife of Wm. Roscoe, Esq.

Lately, at *Naples*, in his 24th year, JOHN, youngest son of William STRUCH, Esq. of York Terrace, Regent's Park.

Additions.

CAPEL LOFFT, Esq. See p. 481.

He was born at Bury St. Edmunds in 1751. He derived his Christian name from his uncle Capel, the Commentator on Shakespeare. He was educated at Eton, whence he went to Peter-House, Cambridge, where he studied the law, and was in due course called to the Bar. The following list of his publications (not including his numerous contributions to periodical works) will shew the activity of his mind, and his zeal for reform, political and ecclesiastical.

The Praise of Poetry, a Poem, 8vo. 1775.—View of the Several Schemes respecting America, 8vo. 1775.—Dialogue on the Principles of the Constitution, 8vo. 1776.—Reports of Cases in the Court of King's Bench from Easter Term, 12 Geo. III. to Michaelmas Term 14 Geo. III. inclusive, folio, 1776.—Observations on Wesley's Second Calm Address and incidentally on other Writings on the American Question, 8vo., 1777.—Observations upon Mrs. Macaulay's Hist. of England, 4to., 1778.—Principia cum

juris universalis tum precipue Anglicani, 2 vols. 12mo., 1779.—Elements of Universal Law, being a Translation of the first volume of the Principia, 12mo., 1779.—An Argument on the Nature of Party and Faction, 8vo., 1780.—Eudosia, or a Poem on the Universe, 8vo., 1781.—Observations on a Dialogue on the Actual State of Parliament, 8vo., 1783.—Inquiry into the Legality and Expediency of increasing the Royal Navy by Subscription for building County Ships, 8vo., 1783.—Translation of the 1st and 2nd Georgics of Virgil, 8vo., 1784.—Essay on the Law of Libels, 8vo., 1785.—Three Letters on the Question of the Regency, 8vo., 1789.—Observations on the First Part of Dr. Knowles's Testimonies of the Divinity of Christ, from the first Four Centuries, 8vo., 1789.—History of the Corporation and Test Acts, 8vo., 1790.—Remarks on the Letter of Edmund Burke concerning the Revolution in France and on the Proceedings of certain Societies in London

relative to that Event, 8vo., 1790.—Essay on the Effects of a Dissolution of Parliament on an Impeachment of the House of Commons for High Crimes and Misdemeanours, 8vo., 1791.—Remarks on the Letter of Mr. Burke to a Member of the National Assembly, with several Papers in addition to the Remarks, on the Reflections of Mr. Burke on the Revolution in France, 8vo., 1791.—The First and Second Books of Milton's Paradise Lost, with Notes, 4to., 1792.—The Law of Evidence by Chief Baron Gilbert, considerably enlarged, to which is prefixed some Account of the Author, his Abstract of Locke's Essay, and his Argument on a Case of Homicide in Ireland, 2 vols. 8vo., 1791 and 1796.—On the Revival of the Cause of Reform in the Representation of the Commons in Parliament, 2nd ed., 8vo., 1810.—Aphorisms from Shakespeare, 18mo., 1812.—Laurana, or an Anthology of Sonnets and Elegiac Quatorzains, Original and Translated, 5 vols., 8vo., 1812.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

Somersetshire, Gloucestershire, and Wiltshire Unitarian Missionary Society.

ON Wednesday, the 8th of September, a Meeting was held at Trim-Street Chapel, Bath, to establish a Half-Yearly Association of Ministers and Members of Unitarian congregations in Somersetshire, Gloucestershire, and Wiltshire, for the purpose of raising a fund towards defraying the expenses of preaching Unitarianism in places where it is not at present known, and to assist in supporting and reviving congregations that are on the decline. The proceedings of the day commenced with divine service, when the Rev. Theophilus Browne opened with prayer and reading of the Scriptures, the Rev. R. Wright, of Trowbridge, offered up the prayer before sermon, and the Rev. M. Maurice, of Frenchay, delivered an excellent discourse from Isaiah iii. 7 : “ How beautiful upon the mountains,” &c., in which he clearly shewed that Unitarianism is not that cold and cheerless system it is often represented to be, but by displaying Almighty God under the endearing character of our heavenly Father, it really brings “ good tidings,” proclaims “ peace,” and publishes “ salvation.” The Rev. Mr. Ketley (late pupil of Dr. Morell) concluded with prayer. The business of the meeting then com-

menced, and G. M. Davidson, Esq., of Warmley-House, near Bristol, being called to the chair, the several resolutions that were proposed were unanimously carried. The ministers and friends afterwards partook of a social, economical dinner together, and were much gratified and encouraged by several interesting observations from the Rev. Messrs. Maurice, Wright, Browne and Tagart (one of the students of the York College). It is to be regretted that, owing to the very unfavourable weather, the presence of many friends from the surrounding country, who had promised their attendance, was prevented.

Unitarians at Biddenden.

SIR,

You will much oblige me, and a small rising Society at Biddenden, in Kent, by giving a place in your valuable work to the following statement :

It is admitted, and I rejoice in the admission, that the applications to the Unitarian public, from small rising societies, and others under difficulties, are both numerous and urgent. Inquiring and reflecting minds, in these times of increasing light and knowledge, perceive more impressively than ever, the importance of offering a sincere and pure homage to the one only living and true God; and this according to the plain and

express directions of their Lord and Master Jesus Christ, himself a sincere and pure worshiper of this great and good Being.

Endowed with social affections, they are also impressed with a sense of the importance of uniting in this sacred duty, but have, in many instances, no convenient buildings in which to hold their meetings.

This is the situation of the above-mentioned Society at Biddenden, who have hitherto met in a small and very inconvenient dwelling-house, and this in two adjoining rooms. They venture, therefore, to solicit the aid of their Unitarian brethren, in erecting a small place of worship; which, as circumstances shall require, may be hereafter enlarged. The expense of this is estimated at £200; for they aim not at any thing but what is quite necessary. Mr. W. Cole, who most deservedly stands high in my esteem and is much valued by them, conducts gratuitously the services in the afternoon and evening. He has also offered them a piece of ground as his subscription, valued at fifteen pounds; which this infant society, consisting principally of poor, have carried up to nearly fifty pounds: a highly commendable effort this, in their circumstances.

They hope for the aid of their friends in this immediate neighbourhood, but are equally convinced of the necessity of this public application, respectfully referring their case to the attention of Fellowship Funds.

L. HOLDEN.

Tenterden, Sept. 11, 1824.

P. S. Donations may be sent to Mr. David Eaton, 187, High Holborn, or to Mr. W. Cole, Biddenden.

Formation of an Unitarian Association for Shropshire, Cheshire, and Staffordshire.

In giving an account of the formation of an Association in this district, it is unnecessary, I presume, to relate the particular circumstances which led to it. It being ascertained, that both the ministers and people of three or four of our congregations were desirous of such a union, the congregation at Whitchurch availed themselves of a measure which they thought likely to secure its accomplishment. They invited the Rev. W. Hincks, of Liverpool, to preach two sermons on Wednesday the 8th inst., and forwarded notice of his kind acceptance of this invitation to those who, it was hoped, would give support to the meeting.

Amongst the gentlemen who favoured

us with their company and services, were the Rev. J. Hawkes, E. Hawkes, M. A., and J. Cooper, of Nantwich; and the Rev. T. Cooper, of Newcastle. Mr. J. Cooper introduced the morning service; Mr. J. Hawkes delivered the second prayer; and Mr. Hincks preached a discourse founded on the important question of Philip, contained in Acts viii. 30, “Understandest thou what thou readest?” The sermon contained, amongst other valuable matter, a fund of information relative to the different versions of the New-Testament Scriptures, which have not only obtained circulation, but also received the sanction of the English Government in different reigns. This was one argument used by the preacher, to shew the impropriety of placing implicit faith in any *one* translation, and the duty of availing ourselves of those versions which contain the most correct and approved translations, and also of the criticisms of those whose learning and integrity give the greatest weight to their testimony. The observance of this rule he considered indispensably necessary, if we would so read that we might *understand* what is contained in the Scriptures. We only wish that the worthy preacher had had a larger audience to benefit by his remarks; but he gave us ample proof that he did not “despise the day of small things.”

After the morning service, thirty-seven friends to the cause, eight of whom were non-residents, dined and spent the afternoon together. Mr. Hincks was in the chair, and contributed much to the spirit and utility of the meeting. He gave a pleasing account of the progress Unitarianism is making both at home and abroad. We are also much indebted for the pleasure we received, to the gentlemen whose names are already mentioned,

At this meeting the following resolutions were carried unanimously:

1. That an Association be formed between the Unitarian Societies of the following places, or as many of them as may hereafter accede to the resolution, viz.: Whitchurch, Nantwich, Delamere Forest, Chester, Congleton, Newcastle, Hanley, and Lane End; and that half-yearly meetings be held in turn at each place on Whit-Tuesdays, and in September.

2. That this Association be called an Association of the adjacent Unitarian congregations in the counties of Shropshire, Cheshire, and Staffordshire.

3. That the Rev. J. Philp, of Whitchurch, be chosen Secretary and Treasurer.

4. That the next Meeting be held at Nantwich, on Whit-Tuesday, 1825.

5. That the Rev. J. Grundy, of Liverpool, be invited to preach on the occasion.

A meeting for religious worship in the evening closed the proceedings of the day. Mr. T. Cooper conducted the introductory parts of the service; and Mr. Hincks delivered a sermon from Mark xii. 29, "Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord." It was an argumentative refutation of the passages commonly advanced in support of the doctrine of the Trinity. We think it must, at least, have lessened the confidence of our Orthodox brethren who were present, in many of their most favourite texts. And we hope that it may be the means of leading them to embrace the unsophisticated truths of the gospel.

It being unusual in this town, for persons of any religious denomination to have a public dinner, many unfavourable conjectures were raised by our adversaries in regard to the effects that would result from such a measure. But I am happy to state that there was so much decorum and prudence observed, as almost to put it beyond the power of calumny itself to raise an evil report.

A pleasing proof was also hereby given, that it is a misgrounded fear when individuals imagine that the conduct of labouring men cannot be trusted in public company. Let those who indulge this feeling, give them a fair opportunity, and they will prove themselves fit members of civilized and enlightened society, and shew that they appreciate wise and liberal sentiments. J. P.

Witchurch, Salop, Sept. 15, 1824.

We have received Irish newspapers, giving an account of the Proceedings of the *Presbyterian Synod of ULSTER*, and of those of the Irish Presbyterian *Seceders*, which we shall hereafter lay before our readers. These documents are useful, as shewing the temper of ecclesiastical bodies, and the distance at which these corporations are from the liberality and improvement of many of the individuals who compose them. The Synod of Ulster disavows "Socinianism," and so does every *Unitarian*; but the Synod likewise forbids the ministers of their body to admit Unitarian preachers into their pulpits, and censures Dr. Bruce for representing, in the Preface to his Sermons, that Unitarianism is making progress within the Synod's limits! This is the time for the liberal part of the Presbyterians in the North of Ireland to assert the *liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free*, and we hope and trust the opportunity will not be lost. There are,

we know, certain secular considerations which require them to be prudent even in their opposition to bigotry; but we believe that there are amongst them men who are capable of conducting the defence of truth so as to shew to the world that its adversaries are in the wrong in a civil point of view.

Ecclesiastical Preferments.

The King has been pleased to appoint Dr. DAVID LAMONT to be one of his Majesty's Chaplains in Ordinary in Scotland, in the room of Dr. David Johnston, deceased; and the Rev. R. H. BARHAM to be one of the Priests in Ordinary of his Majesty's Chapels Royal.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Tribute of Respect to the Rev. J. Grundy.

It is known to most of our readers that Mr. Grundy, lately one of the ministers of Cross Street, Manchester, has been chosen to succeed Mr. Yates in the pastoral office in Paradise Street, Liverpool. On the 12th of August, a dinner of his friends was held at Manchester, for the purpose of presenting to him a handsome silver Tea Service, "as a testimony of their high regard for the zeal he has evinced in the cause of Unitarian Christianity." The company consisted of about 120 persons. Mr. Richard Potter presided. The speeches on the occasion, which have been reported in the newspapers, are extremely interesting, and have given rise, we understand, to a newspaper controversy. Mr. Robberds's address in reference to his late colleague is remarkable for its propriety and affectionate spirit. The Chairman was supported by Mr. Benjamin Naylor, as Vice-President; and the whole proceedings are creditable to the talents and zeal of our Manchester brethren, and present a pleasing example of congregational harmony and brotherly love.

W. EMPSON, Esq., M. A., of Trinity College, Barrister of the Inner Temple, has been appointed by the East-India Directors to succeed Sir James Mackintosh, Bart., as Law Professor at Hareleybury.

Charitable Bequests.—The late Sir FENWICK BULMER, brother to the distinguished typographer of that name, has, by a codicil to his will, left the following sums to public charities, viz. 100*l.* to the Charity School of Saint Clement Danes; 500*l.* to the Philanthropic Society; 500*l.* to the Refuge for the Desti-

tute; 500*l.* to the British and Foreign School Society; 21*l.* to the Westminster Infirmary; 500*l.* to the Magdalen Hospital; 500*l.* to Wilson's Charitable Fund; 250*l.* to the Society for the Relief of Persons Imprisoned for Small Debts; 250*l.* to the Society for relieving the Poor at their own Habitations.

The Duke of SUSSEX has the most stupendous collection of theological works extant, between 60 and 70,000 volumes; among which there are upwards of 150 different editions of the Bible. It is reported that his Royal Highness means to bequeath the entire collection to one of the Universities.—*Newspapers.*

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

A Review of the Missionary Life and Labours of Richard Wright. Written by Himself. 12mo. 8*s.*

Unitarianism Philosophically and Theologically examined, comprising a Complete Refutation of the Leading Principles of the Unitarian System. By the Rev. A. Kohlman. 8vo. 12*s.*

An Account of the Life and Religious Opinions of John Bawn, of Frenchay. By Michael Maurice. Also, Answers to some Objections frequently advanced against Unitarians. 12mo. 6*d.*

Richmond, and its Vicinity. With a Glance at Twickenham, Strawberry Hill and Hampton Court. By John Evans, LL.D. 12mo. 4*s.*

An Address on Opening a New School Room, belonging to the Trustees of Mr. Baylie's Charity, in Tower Street, Dudley, March 22, 1824. By James Hews Bransby. 8vo.

Bibliotheca Biblica, a Select List of Books on Sacred Literature; with Notices Biographical, Critical, and Bibliographical, intended as a Guide to the Consultation of the most Useful Writers on Biblical Subjects. By William Orme, Author of the Life of John Owen, D. D. 8vo. 12*s.*

Ingenuous Scruples, chiefly relating to the Observance of the Sabbath, answered. By A. C. Mant. 12mo. 5*s.*

Report of the Committee of the Society for the Mitigation and Gradual Abolition of Slavery, read at the General Meeting, June 25, 1824: with an Account of the Proceedings. 2*s.*

Familiar Illustrations of the Principal Evidences and Design of Christianity. By Maria Hack. 18mo. 3*s.*

Exercises on the Globes and Maps; interspersed with some Historical, Biographical, Chronological, Mythological, and Miscellaneous Information; on a New Plan. To which are added, Questions for Examination, designed for the Use of Young Ladies. By the late William Butler. Tenth Edition. With an

Appendix, by which the Stars may easily be known. By Thomas Bourn, Teacher of Writing, Arithmetic and Geography. 12mo. 6*s.* Bound.

The First Book of Euclid's Elements of Geometry, demonstrated in General Terms. By Richard Garde, A. B.

Account of the Royal Hospital and Collegiate Church of St. Katharine, near the Tower of London. By J. B. Nichols, F. S. A. F. L. S. 4to. Six Plates. 10*s.* 6*d.*

The History of Mexico from the Spanish Conquest to the present Era. By Nicholas Mill, Esq. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

A Summary View of America—being the Result of Observations and Inquiries during a Journey in the United States. By an Englishman. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

The Topography of all the known Vineyards. Abridged from the French. 12mo. 6*s.*

The Emigrant's Note Book and Guide; with Recollections of Upper and Lower Canada during the late War. By J. C. Morgan, H. M. late 2nd Batt. R. M. 12mo. Drawings. 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Annual Register, for 1823. 8vo. 16*s.*

The Pastor of Blamont, an Authentic Narrative of the Ministry and Sufferings of the Rev. J. F. Nardin, a French Protestant of the Seventeenth Century. 18mo. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Some Account of the Life and Writings of the late Rev. Thomas Rennell, B. D. F. R. S., Vicar of Kensington and Prebendary of Salisbury. 8vo. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Songs of Solynta; or a New Version of the Psalms of David. By Baptist-Noel Turner, M. A., Rector of Denton, in Lincolnshire, &c. 8vo.

The Remains of Robert Bloomfield, (Author of the Farmer's Boy, &c.), in Poetry and Prose. 2 Vols. foolscap 8vo. 12*s.*

Select Proverbs of all Nations. To which is added, a Summary of Ancient Pastimes, &c. 18mo. 5*s.*

Melodies from the Gaelic, and Original Poems, with Notes on the Superstitions of the Highlanders. By Donald Macpherson. 12mo. 5s.

A Poet's Thoughts on the Interment of Lord Byron. By William Howitt, one of the Authors of the Forest Minstrel. 1s.

The Improvisatrice; and other Poems. By L. E. L. With Embellishments.

Tales of a Traveller. By the Author of the Sketch Book. 2 Vols. 8vo. 17. 4s.

Redwood, a Tale. By the Author of "A New-England Tale." 3 Vols. 12mo. 17. 1s.

A Letter to Robert Hibbert, Jun., Esq., in Reply to his Pamphlet, "Facts verified upon Oath, in Contradiction of the Report of the Rev. Thomas Cooper concerning the General Condition of the Slaves in Jamaica," &c. To which are added, A Letter from Mrs. Cooper to R. Hibbert, Jun., Esq.; and an Appendix, containing an Exposure of the Falsehoods and Calumnies of that Gentleman's Affidavit-Men. By Thomas Cooper. 2s. 6d.

Observations upon Slavery; setting forth, that to hold the Principle of Slavery is to deny Christ. By Robert Lin-doe, M. D. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Eighteenth Report of the Directors of the African Institution. 8vo. 4s.

Immediate, not Gradual, Abolition of Negro Slavery. 4d.

Suggestions for the Improvement of Ireland. By the Author of "Civil Disabilities," &c. 2s.

Rev. Edward Irving's Defence of Himself against the Critics. 2s.

Letters to a Candid Reader of the Letter of R. Bransby Cooper, Esq. M. P., "on the Peculiar Tenets of the Present Day," intended as a Reply to that Publication. By the Rev. John K. Whish, A. M. 3s.

Christ's Victory and Triumph in Heaven and Earth, over and after Death. By Giles Fletcher. With an Original Biographical Sketch of the Author. (Accurately and handsomely printed from the Edition of 1610.) 3s.

The Importance of Mental Cultivation, united with Personal Religion in the Christian Ministry: an Introductory Lecture to the Students of the Irish Evangelical Society's Academy, Manor Street, Dublin; with an Appendix, containing an Account of the Origin and Plan of the Society, and the Course of Studies. By W. H. Cooper, Classical and Scientific Tutor. 1s.

Sermons.

Three; preached upon the Occasion of his Final Departure from Gloucestershire. By Henry Ryder, D. D., Lord Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry. 2s.

Outlines of Four Sermons: entitled, 1. The Sepulchre of Psammis, the Son of Necho. 2. The Knowledge of the Truth. 3 and 4. Insanity no Symptom of Conviction or Conversion. By R. Polwhele, Vicar of Newlyn and St. Anthony, Cornwall. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Christ's last Prayer with his Disciples; or, a Series of Sermons on the Seventeenth Chapter of John. By John Jefferson, of Kendal. 8vo. 10s.

Single.

Requisites for fulfilling the Christian Ministry: preached in the Cathedral Church of Lichfield, at the Primary Visitation, August 30, 1824. By Edward Cooper, A. B., Rector of Hamstall Ridware. 1s.

Preached before the Prayer-Book and Homily Society, May 5, 1824. By Basil Woodd, M. A. With the Twelfth Report of the Society.

Occasioned by the Death of Thomas Chevalier, Esq., F. S. A., F. L. S. and F. H. S.: delivered at Keppel-Street Chapel, June 20, 1824. By Geo. Pritchard.

On the Death of Lord Byron. By a Layman. 1s.

The Religious Instruction of the Slaves in the West-India Colonies defended: before the Wesleyan Missionary Society, April 28. By Richard Watson, one of the Secretaries.

The Death of Judas: delivered at the Union Monthly Lecture. By David Stuart, Dublin. With Notes. 1s.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Mr. T. C. Holland; Proselytus; Apostolicus; Overton; N. E.; and G. M. D.

A. B. shall hear from the Editor shortly.

F. of Birmingham, should have addressed his letter to the Editor as directed on the blue cover, and moreover have paid the postage.

The account of the "Ordination of the Rev. Franklin Baker," at Bolton, arrived too late for insertion in the present Number.